

THE TRUE FOUNDER OF CHRISTIANITY
AND
THE HELLENISTIC PHILOSOPHY

by

Max Rieser

GRADUATE PRESS
AMSTERDAM / UITHOORN
1979

ISBN 90 6296 081 2
Printed in The Netherlands

CONTENTS

The incarnation of the Logos.	7
Genealogy of Christianity	13
Trial of Jesus	15
The Eucharist	16
The place of origin.	22
The literary origin of crucifixion	24
The Works of the Apostles	28
Quo vadis.	39
The problem of the origin and the achievements of Christianity	40
Monograms and Symbols	45
The Trinity	49
The death trial of the Xristos.	52
Redemption, catharsis, baptism	56
The Quarrel about the Faith	60
The phases of Christianity.	63
The Roman origins of Christianity	65
Jewish parties and Greek philosophers.	72
Judaism and messianism	74
The way of Christianity	80
Original sin.	87
Resume	88

The incarnation of the Logos

Christianity has no founder in the usual sense, because it was originally not considered a new religion, but a messianic completion of the Jewish religion. The gospels of the New Testament cannot be regarded as historical documents, because their accounts lack information and their writers are unknown. As authors of the two basic synoptic gospels are named after Marcos and Mathaios. These are two names used at that time by Hellenistic Jews, one of them is Latin, the other shortened Hebrew. The name of the third is most probably of Latin origin (Lucas) with a Greek ending. He is the most elaborate and the most novelistic of the three and is also the most anti-Jewish. He dedicates his gospel as well as the "Praxeis apostolon" to a Theophilos, who, however, does not seem a real person. His name means "Beloved of God", (similar to the Hebrew Yohanan, the German Gottlieb or the Slavic Bogumil.) In other words the writing is addressed to persons beloved of God. These names are fictitious and have probably some symbolic meaning, the initials being LMM. None of these alleged writers was present at, or eye-witness of, the events described by him, so that the contents of their writings are based on some hearsay. The fourth gospel stands apart, the author is said to be "Ioannes" i.e. Iohanan, but this is also the name of John the Baptist, who is an important personage in this gospel. This gospel has a philosophical introduction, which refers clearly to the philosophy of Philon of Alexandria. It sets therefore the origin of the messianic faith in the center of the Hellenistic world as the continuation of the amalgamation of the Hellenistic thought and Judaism which began with the translation of the Old Testament into Greek, an act which must have seemed to the pious Jews of Palestine as a desecration of the holy language in which God spoke to Moses. The origin of the new faith was therefore not based on the alleged thaumaturgic short activity of an itinerant

preacher in a provincial part of the world, but on the Logos philosophy of the most prominent Alexandrian Jew of that time. This introduction imitates in style and content the passages of the Genesis about the creation of the world and establishes God and the Logos as creators of the world, whereby the true creator is not the God Father, but the Logos. Philon established a Trinity consisting of God the Logos and the Kosmos, and calls the Logos *the Son of God!* The Christian Trinity differs from the Philonian in that the Kosmos is omitted, and the Holy Ghost added. But it should be observed that son of God which some Christians understood rather biologically might have a different meaning in Philon. He may have in mind the Hebrew "ben" meaning son, but also meaning something else. The "benei Israel" means simply the Israelites, not the sons of Yisrael, the B'nei Yemini" does not mean the sons of Benjamin, but the Benjaminites or the "people of (the canaanite) Yemen. To call the Logos "son" in the literal sense would be equivocal.

This introduction incorporates the Messianic faith within the ken of Hellenistic philosophy. Whether it is from the same hand as the remaining text of the gospel, is another question. This text features first St. John the Baptist i.e. the eremite Yo-hanan and then as a parallel of his the Xristos Iesous. But the strong protestations of Yohanan that he was not the sought messiah seem to suggest that such a messiah as a living realization of the Logos was "sought" perhaps not geographically but spiritually and that the sanctity of Yohanan led first to the assumption that he was the messiah sought after. But the messiah means the "Anointed one" and that is only a king and Yohanan was not of kingly birth, while the latter was attributed to the messiah Iesous — at least in the gospels, because there existed no descendeants of King David in reality. Whether "gospel" or "evangelion" means really "glad tidings" seems a moot point, it may mean "bad tidings" (in Hebrew: bessorah) and be really a euphemism or equivocal, because the coming of the messiah means also the end of the world. The search for the messiah (indicated in the gospel "kata Ioannen) was successful and this is shown by the expression "kai ho Logos sarx egeneto", "The Logos became flesh"; this expression means the birth of the new messianic religion, the finding of the Anointed one in

whom the Logos was incarnated. Here the origin of the faith is indicated. It is also said that those who saw him, rejected him. The Xristos is, compared with Moses, but it is said that while Moyses gave the law (nomos), the Xristos gave the grace and the truth (Xaris kai Aletheia). Then in the genealogy of the Xristos the name of the sister of Moyses (Miriam or Mariam) is attributed to his mother. That the family of the Xristos fled to Egypt, while Moses fled from Egypt is a negative parallelism. The place of origin of the Logos philosophy and of the epiphany of the incarnate Logos becomes the place of refuge of the new Moyses.

It is not clear from the Old Testament who this alleged messiah or Anointed one (in Greek: Xristos) is supposed to be. Deutero-Isaiah calls (chapter 45,1) also the Persian king Cyrus "This Anointed one". In a study "Isaiah 40-66" (Leiden 1977) Harry M. Orlinsky states that the concepts (of Deutero-Isaiah) "servant of the Lord" and "suffering servant" are post-biblical and used after the death of and in conjunction with Jesus. Norman H. Snaith confirms there that these ideals were applied to Jesus of Nazareth and were the exclusive nationalistic application of the returning exiles. I think that these expressions are not post-biblical. The concept "Ebed JHVH" (servant of the Lord) is not applied to a man but to the people of Israel as a whole, Moses is also "ebed JHVH" and this means simply "*worshipper* of JHVH". Chapter 43,11, speaks of "my worshipper" meaning the people of Israel; 44,1 says: *shema Jacob abdi*: listen my worshipper Jacob, which means the people of Israel, and 44,21: thou art my servant (worshipper) Israel. The conclusive proof that the so-called messiah of chapter 53 is not a person, but the people of Israel is in 53,12 (Therefore will I divide him a portion with the great ...) because this cannot refer to a person, but it does refer to the people of Israel as such. The savior of Israel mentioned in the Deutero-Isaiah is *kadosh Israel* (The Holy one in Israel) and this is God. Read correctly the Deutero-Isaiah is a poem appealing to the Jews in exile to return home and to rebuild the country. Everything will be new, even the sky. There are many messianic stories in the Old Testament. This symbolic use of a person for the people of Israel is not unique. It seems obvious that the book Hiob also

refers cryptically not to any person, but to Jacob, i.e. the people of Israel like the Deutero-Isaiah who nowhere refers to any personal Messiah. This poem has no real ending. Both Hiob (or Jacob) and the Deutero-Isaiah maintain that the Jews should not quarrel with God because his motives are superior to human understanding. And the misfortunes of Hiob are national, not personal misfortunes just as those of Deutero-Isaiah. And as to the Son of God which Philon identified with Logos, it may be observed that Psalm 2,7 states "... the Lord hath said unto me: Thou art my Son; this day have I begotten thee.", which is obviously symbolic. These messianic stories deal only with the regeneration of Israël. Another one is in "Malachi", the twelfth little prophet, whose name occurs in the text as "I will send my *messenger* ..." (malachi) which may mean also my angel alive who will be preceded by the prophet Elijah, who is understood in his turn alive ... (despite his absconding to heaven. He will warn them (the people of Israel) that the messenger will come like the Paraclete of the New Testament and punish the sinners, especially the sinning priests (Levites). The messenger may be also understood as messiah, but he is an angel of God. Here the trinity consists of God, Elijah and the messenger. Another Trinity is that in the prophet Jonah consisting of God, the Big Fish and Jonah. But Jonah the prophet has a name which means "dove". For that reason the third person in the messianic Trinity (God, Logos (Son and Holy Ghost) is symbolized by a "dove". The gospel "kata Ioannen" has no genealogy of the Xristos, he has still brothers and a mother like other men. And there is no question here of the Virginity of his mother. Although he is pictured in this gospel as a second Moses, his genealogy in the synoptic gospels imitates rather the birth of Isaac by Sara (the princess) with the annunciation by an angel etc. The virginal birth is of course miraculous but an incarnate Logos needs perhaps no mother. Therefore there may be logic in the virginal birth. The Logos or Son of God was born really in the philosophy of Philon and its incarnation was "sought" as the gospel "kata Ioannen" indicates. It was found in the stories told about him.

The messianic faith would be impossible without the symbolic method of interpretation of the Old Testament by Philon, modelled on the symbolic interpretation of the Homeric poems

by the Alexandrian scholars, a system still expanded by the followers of Philon, who adopted the messianic vision, which consisted in the eschatological conception of messianism. Originally an Anointed one (Messiah) is a king of Israel who is under special protection of the deity as such (David would not kill Saul because he is an Anointed one), but even Cyrus, a non-Jewish king is also an anointed one. The later meaning of the word may have been influenced by the Persian religion, according to which in 3000 years a holy man would reconcile the Powers of Light and Darkness and finish their eternal strife. This is a messianic concept in the later sense. There are other traces of the Persian religion in the Book Esther, but the mythological story is transformed in a historical national sense as all originally mythological Israelite stories about deities of the Old Testament were transformed. The Persians did not persecute the Jews, the Book Esther really deals with the struggle of the Powers of Light (Ahashverosh) against those of Darkness (Haman). Ahuramazda is changed into Ahashverosh and Angromainyu into Haman. Ahashverosh means "the One and the Head), this is the main god, not the king of Persia. The powers of Light win with the help of Esther or Ishtar or Astarte – or Ishah (Isis in Egyptian mythology). The queen Vashti who is destroyed is perhaps Vesta. Mordehai is Marduk, the Babylonian god that helps to destroy the forces of darkness. This mythological story is transformed into a national event on the day of the Babylonian New Year. This too is a Jewish messianic story, Marduk and Esther as saviors.

The gospel (kata Ioannen) has a passage in which it is said that "priests and Levites" were sent to John the Baptist and asked him whether he is Elijah, a prophet or the messiah. Why priests and Levites"? Obviously the writer thinks that they were the most knowledgeable in religious things.

This was certainly not the case at the time this was written, in addition priests and Levites formed no organized body that would be able to send delegates to a lonely eremite nor would they be interested in doing so. At this time Herodes Antipas was officially ruler by the grace of the Romans and he was an Idumean (of the House of Edom or Esau). Those Edomites were always considered as enemies of the Jews as the prophet Obadiah

declares so eloquently. They were subjugated and forced to circumcision by the Hasmonean king Hyrcanos.

Moses is said in the Pentateuch to be from the tribe of Levi, hence a Levite. But his birth is mythological and a paraphrase of the story of Isis and Osiris. Isis (Issah or Ishah) exists also in Jewish mythology and her beloved Osiris is the Hebrew Asser. Ishah or Issah (in Hebrew: Woman or goddess) is contained in the story of Eliyahu and Elisha which is obviously a divine couple which was later on transformed into the prophet Elijah and his pupil Elisha. Eliyahu means "God Yahu" and Elisha "God-Woman". Therefore Elijah never dies, was absconded into heaven and his coming at the Passah feast is even now expected by pious Jews. Therefore they leave the door open to let him enter. Moyzes is an Egyptian word and means "son". Whose son was he? Probably of Isis and Osiris, not of the daughter of the Pharaoh but according to the Bible his father was Amram and his mother Jochebed. Amram is similar to Abram and to the Phenician Hiram. These are Canaanite names. Abram or Abraham may be Abaram i.e. father or god of the Aramaeans. Amram may also be a shortened Amaram i.e. the people of Aram while Jo-chebed means "worshipper of Yah" which is the name of the Jewish god (as in hallelu-yah), praise the Lord (Yah). Egyptian is also the word "sus" meaning horse in Hebrew and the name Pinehasset which is shortened in Hebrew to Pinhas and is used often as first name by the Jews today.

The word Moses is contained in such Egyptian names as Ramses i.e. the Son of Rha or Tutmes, the Son of Tut. The Pentateuch states that the Israelites were forced to do heavy work in Egypt and to build the cities Pitom and Ramses. These are rather names of gods, not of cities: son of Rha is Ramses and Pitom seems to refer to the god Ptah. Cassius Dion maintained that the Jews were Egyptians which seems doubtful, because their language was Canaanite, similar to those of other Canaanites and to those of the Phenicians and Cartaginians. Hannibal is identical with Hannibaal and is similar to the Hebrew Jo-hanan, only the name of God is in the Phenician version Baal and in the Hebrew one Yah.

Genealogy of Christianity

It is fitting that the gospel "kata Ioannen" contains no terrestrial genealogy of the Xristos, because the words "kai Logos sarx egeneto" mark both the genealogy of the Xristos and of Christianity – albeit the mythical one. The whole gospel is nothing else than a description of the miracles performed by the Xristos, because they are supposed to legitimize him (as the Logos incarnate, Son of God or messiah). Here is also the rejection of the Temple of Jerusalem as the center of the (Jewish) faith, the comparison of the body of Xristos as the real Temple and the prediction that this Temple will be rebuilt i.e. resuscitated after three days i.e. the prediction of immortality and the "prediction" of the destruction of the Temple of Jerusalem. This destruction is here established as the condition of the establishment of the messianic faith. This is in addition a positive assessment of the destruction of the Temple of Jerusalem by the Romans which could have scarcely be voiced by a Palestinian Jew. The destruction of the Temple is initially by no means a punishment for the killing of the messiah, but a punishment for its corruption and a vindication of the belief in the Messiah. The messiah has only a literary or symbolic, not a historical existence. To the pagan Hellenistic mind the literary symbolic existence of the messiah could have been just as real as the existence of a painting or sculpture, of Athene in Athens, of Zeus in Olympia or Artemis in Ephesus or Magna Mater Austriae in Mariazell or the icon of the Mother of God in Częstochowa (Poland).

It should be reaffirmed that just as a man from the Israelitic Yemen is a "ben Yemini" so that ben Yemini means a Yemenite, not a son of Benjamin, just as "bath Babel" means a Babylonian woman and "a bethulah bath Babel" a Babylonian virgin, there is no tribe of Benjamin, not a "son of God" of Philon means simply a divine thing, the Christian translation of this expression into the literal meaning of son is based on a misunderstanding of the Hebrew usage. As the history of the Jews or Hebrews took a long time, they themselves did not understand the original of some words or changed the meaning on purpose. Thus this gospel (kata Ioannen) in objecting to alleged Jewish

recriminations against the Xristos mentions that the Jews called themselves "Gods (elohim)" which refers to a quotation of the Exodus where the slave that wants to remain slave is conducted to the gods (to the elohim) to reaffirm this. The Psalms refer to this quotation in a similar way. But this cannot be correct. The slave was obviously conducted to a place where the gods of Israel (at least two) were pictured, because this was the most sacred spot and the name "elohim" was retained as the place of judgment. These "elohim" may have been Eliya and Elisha.

The fictive speeches in which the writer of the gospel addresses himself to the so-called delegates of the "archproests and Pharisees" to attack really the observation of the Sabbath and the circumcision not openly but cryptically and implicitly, because these Jews object that the Xristos has rendered the vision to a blind man on Sabbath. This, they think, is a desecration of the Sabbath (*mehalei sabbath*). This is completely false. No Jew would think that causing a miracle is a work. If it is a real miracle, it was a work of God or was it witchcraft? He is not accused of that. The speeches of the Xristos are a dramatization of the standpoint of the supporters of Hellenistic messianism and these fictive speeches are addressed to a non-existing body namely to "the archpriests and Pharisees". There was only one archpriest and the Pharisees were no institution, but a party in Israel, in fact the bulk of the nation shared the views of the so-called Pharisees. It has little sense to say that the "archpriests and the Pharisees" have sent anybody to a person, let alone to a completely unknown individual.

The author speaks of the Jews as of a foreign nation and lets the Judean Xristos adopt this form of language "You, *hymeis*, your law etc. If the Xristos was a Jew, he could not speak in that way. This is a Hellenistic story about a Jewish messiah. The texts of the gospels differ, because these are different versions of a religious dramatic novel. The miracles reported in this gospel are a sort of illustration of what the Xristos is. He makes people blind from birth see, because he is "the light of the world and he makes the blinds see! He is the bread of life, therefore the breads and the fishes and the wine are multiplied. This illustrates in a comparative way that he is the bread of life although the meaning of this sentence is different. It means that he gives

eternal life after death to those that believe in him. The last words of the Xristos are in this gospel "it is phinished" and in the other gospels he quotes a psalm: why has thou left me (or: sacrificed me)? But these are not the last words of a Jew. They should be "Shema, Israel, Hear, Yisrael, JHVH our God, JHVH one". But the Xristos speaks in this gospel as if he were not a Jew. The saying of the Xristos addressed "to the Jews" that they circumcize on sabbath is at the same time a cryptic attack against circumcision and against the observation of the Sabbath which cannot come from inside Israel, but comes from outside, where these two customs constitute together with dietary laws, the main difference between Jews and pagans.

Inside Judea this played no role, because everybody observed these customs, but outside these were the main properties of Judaism to the socalled Hellenes i.e. non-Jews, the most visible and the most objectionable ones. The anti-Jewish emperor Hadrian decreed after the uprising of Bar Kochba (120 AD) the prohibition of circumcision. Thus he wanted to erase Jerusalem by founding there the colony Aelia Capitolina and forbade circumcision. It was therefore natural that the non-Jewish followers of messianism or Christianity did not like these Jewish customs which were considered typically Jewish. They abolished the the Sabbath altogether and made Sunday a day of rest.

Trial of Jesus

The socalled trial as reported in this gospel is a travesty of a trial in a court of law. That a Jew affirmed, that he was a servant of Caesar and not of a Jewish king, is a culmination of political nonsense. The socalled trial in which the Xristos states that he is not a king of this world, but of the heavenly world has also little sense, because a Roman official did not care about the heavenly world and could not understand such a statement. The poet Horace admonished the Romans to rule the nations, that this was their only task and destiny. The task of the presentation of this form of trial was to accuse the Jews and to exculpate the Romans. Now the bulk of Jews was really opposed to messianism in this form. Jewish socalled messianism was vague

and undetermined. The messiah was also undetermined, sometimes it was Elijah, sometimes an angel, sometimes a king of Israel, sometimes Israel itself at the end of time. The incarnation of the Logos in a human being and a definite person in the present, the assumption of the immediate end of the world did not appeal to the Palestine Jews, but to some Jews of the diaspora. The first chapter of the gospel "kata Ioannen" could well be a chapter in the history of Hellenistic philosophy, its continuation after Philon. The neo-Platonic philosophy of Plotinus was a continuation of the Philonian philosophy, only with the omission of the theological Jewish names. There was no God but Hen (The One). There was no creation, but a creation from nothing as indicated in the Genesis of the Pentateuch is an emanation from the Hen. The theory of emanation is an elaborate repetition of the Genesis with the benefit of the omission of the name of Jewish deity. The models of this philosophy are less to be sought in Plato and more in its Jewish predecessor Philon.

The Eucharist

The words instituting the eucharist are (Matt. 26,26-28): "And as they were eating, Jesus took bread, and blessed it, (eulogesas) and gave it to the disciples, and said: Take, this is my body, and he took the cup and gave thanks (kai eucharistesas edoken autois, legon): and gave it to them, saying, drink ye all of it; for this is my blood (to haima mou tes *diathekes*) of the New Testament which is shed for many for the remission of sins". These words could never be said by the Xristos himself before his death, because this presupposes already the finished theory of the messianic faith, worked out after his death. He could not have used the expression "diatheke" (covenant) because there wasn't any at that time (i.e. before his death). But what about the expressions "eulogein" and "eucharizestai" used here in the gospel? These are simply the "blessings" or "brachoth" which the Jews pronounce before they eat the bread and drink the wine. (For instance: Praized be thou, o Lord, that createst the fruit of the vine".) In the case of the meal for the dead which is

in question here, it is naturally said after, not before one's death. Not the person who is to die, says it, but of course the bereaved say it after his death and burial and honor him thereby. If they refuse him this last service, they would dishonor him. The bereaved must not be reminded of doing it, they know it as a matter of course. It is a Jewish custom which the Jews must know, not the readers of the gospel. Supposing that the messiah was an observant Jew, he could have never said that benediction before his death, is the utterance of the bereaved. *Haima mou tes diathekes* (blood of the new covenant) is theological language. The simple blessings which the Jews pronounce, when they eat bread and drink wine *for* the dead, are transformed here symbolically into eating the body and drinking the blood *of* the dead messiah. As the Xristos was resurrected, he will now restore thereby the power of resurrection and eternal life to all communicants. This belief in the power of the faith to render life eternal is the main characteristic of Christian messianism as opposed to the Jewish one where the renovation of the Jewish people is the main thing, it is therefore national, not universal and individualistic. This belief was powerful enough to convert the Greco-Roman world to this pseudo-Jewish faith and what is more, to maintain it for almost 2000 years. But this was neither a Jewish nor an Oriental faith, it was a Hellenistic occidental faith issuing in Hellenistic Alexandria and Hellenistic Rome. Christianity is extremely death-conscious but — as against Buddhism — it is not death loving. It is loving life, because it wants to vanquish death and to make life eternal. When German religious science put Christianity probably following Schopenhauer into the so-called salvational religions (Erlösungsreligionen), what this meant was religions preaching salvations or liberation *from* life, while Christian creed wants just the opposite salvation *of* life. According to this the highest type of religion are the "Erlösungsreligionen such as Buddhism (and of course Christianity), but this is just a complete disfiguring of the meaning of the Christian religion. Schopenhauer started this trend in Germany in praising Christianity as pessimistic and opposing it to optimistic Judaism. This is a perversion of truth, it is obvious that Christianity is — if at all — more optimistic than Judaism where the assumption

of eternal life (after death) is by no means a general belief. But it was just the promise of eternal life that attracted the Hellenistic populations to the Messianism of the New Testament.

Literally the eucharist means the benediction pronounced before the eating of bread and before the drinking of wine, but this bread is thought to be the body of the Xristos and this wine is supposed to be his blood. This concept goes obviously back to the basic concept of Christianity namely "Logos sarx egeneto" and the idea is to eat this flesh and to drink this blood to gain thereby eternal life. The reason is clear: he is the bread of life which means the purveyor of eternal life (after death) and therefore those who believe in him, should eat his flesh and drink his blood. In the gospel (kata Ioannen) it is not said, how this should be done, it could not be meant literally when this was written, because the Xristos was not alive at that time and it could not be meant literally when he was alive. Here this saying is not yet solidified into a custom as in the synoptic gospels, where it must be an interpolation for different reasons. This is uttered at the last supper, which is the supper on the eve of the Passah festivity. This is also the farewell dinner of the Xristos. Now in the gospel kata Ioannen there is no eucharist formula as in the three synoptic ones, however, the main theme of this gospel is the flesh of the Xristos into which the Logos of God was converted. And this is put into his own mouth: Whoso eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood hath eternal life and I will raise him up at the last day" (St. John 6,54). This is the essence of the messianism of the saints. He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me and i in him" (ibidem 56). The last supper is that on the eve of Easter when the Jewish scholars told the stories about the exodus from Egypt. Instead in the gospel of St. John there are very moving admonitions of the disciples, and a statement that he will send them a Comforter namely the Holy Ghost which seems an interpolation and so is the long allegory of the vine. But what is the formula of the eucharist which appears in the other gospels and whose institution is attributed to the Xristos himself? "Eucharizesthai or eulogein means simply in Latin "benedicere". This is the benediction that the Jews pronounce when they eat bread or drink wine, the "bracha" which begins with the words: "baruch

atha JHVH" i.e. "praized art thou o Lord", "bore pri hagafen", who createst the fruit of the vine, or "motzi lehem min haarez", who producest bread out of the earth. These are the two benedictions and this is in Greek "eucharizesthai" or "eulogein". Such a benediction is said whenever bread is eaten or wine is drunk but in the socalled last supper it is said on the eve of Easter, when the feast is started with eating unleavened bread and drinking (mostly) red wine. The formula of the eucharist suggests the *symbolic* eating of the flesh and drinking the wine (blood) of the Xristos, the theological discussions about its nature notwithstanding. The formula merely suggests, how this eating and drinking should be accomplished. The gospel of St. John lacks this formula and the last supper (i.e. the Eve of Easter supper) has only the farewell address of the Xristos to his disciples and to the world which, he says, he had overcome. This farewell address shows, how far the Logos philosophy of the "saints" has traveled from the stories about the exodus of the Jews from Egypt. It shows also, how the amalgamation of the Logos with the anointedhood or messianism involved the believers in the search for a descendant of the royal house of David and the conflict with the Jews about the King of the Jews which culminated literally in the derisive placing of a crown of thorns and the inscription of Pilatus. But these scissions arose among the Jews of Alexandria and Rome, not in Palestine and they found an issue in the story of the crucifixion which was imputed to the Jews in the literary form of the gospels, but had nothing whatever to do with the realistic events in Palestine. In the farewell address in the gospel of St. John the Xristos merely says in very moving terms that he is returning to his father i.e. to God from whom he went out. This is quite natural, if he is the Logos. But the word "father" also means God, it is used in this sense. It is contained in the names of Abraham and Jacob and these are probably Aramean or Hebrew deities, not any patriarchs as a later tradition converted them into, preserving only one deity Yahuah JHVH which was probably the God of Jehuda, a province in Southern Israel. The word "ab" is also contained in the name "Abel" either as Ab El meaning Father God or Ab Bel meaning God Bel. Babel may mean either the door to god or the door to the god Bel.

It is a fact that the main rite of Christianity is nothing else than the benediction uttered originally by Jews at eating bread and drinking wine. But in Christianity it was transformed into eating the body of Christ and drinking his blood – symbolically of course. It was suggested that the eucharist was derived from the meal of bread and wine which the Jews consumed in honor of their dead. It was therefore in this case a “dapes post mortem”, but in the three gospels the institution is attributed to Christ himself before, not after his death. And this attribution is an impossibility, because if Jesus knew this custom, how could he suggest that his disciples should honor him in this way after his death? In the first place they would have done it any way and in the second place he did not really die, because he knew that he would be resurrected, so the meal in his honor would not be necessary. This meal is mentioned in Jeremiah and also in Hesekiel without any messianic connotation (Jeremiah 16,7; Hesekiel 24,17: “lekhem hanashim” and “koss thankhumim”). This was a love meal with which the bereaved were comforted and the deceased honored by breaking of the bread and drinking of the wine. In the synoptic gospels this is put into the mouth of the Xristos himself and in the old traditional form this would be a logical and psychological impossibility, because nobody orders his relatives to honor him in this way after death. Not doing it is a mortal offense of the deceased. The eucharist shows that the aim of the messianic faith is the avoidance of eternal death. This is to be achieved by the resurrection of the body as was done to the Xristos and as the prophet Daniel understood immortality. The Jews did not know the Platonic concept of a duality of a mortal body and immortal soul. The eternal life was the resurrection of the dead (thechiyatth ha methim). The eucharist is the transformation of a simple Jewish benediction into a symbolic pagan rite of eating the body and drinking the blood of a deceased god or half-god, in order to gain his properties, namely immortality. Intellectually it is a sort of symbolic regression into endogenetic cannibalism as practiced still today by some Indians of the Amazon river who eat the ashes of the deceased hoping thereby to gain their strength.

It does not seem to me that it is necessary to link the eucharist

with a specific custom, namely the meal after death, because the benediction in question is said with any eating of bread or drinking of wine. As the last supper was in lieu of the Passah meal, the bread eaten in Israel was unleavened. The eucharist commemorates the death of the Xristos which occurred at Easter which commemorated the exodus from Egyptian servitude, while the death of the Xristos meant the exodus from mortality into eternal life. This could be achieved only through his self-immolation which resembles the animal sacrifices in the Temple, practiced to placate the deity or wash away the sins with blood. Human sacrifices may have preceded animal sacrifices. Still Deutero-Isaiah denounces the Jews that worship the idols under every tree and sacrifice their children under the rocks as other Canaanites. This happened in the glen of Hinnom near Jerusalem (Ge-Hinnom) and therefore the Ge-Hinnom was later on identified as the hell probably because of the cries of the sacrificed i.e. murdered children. These children were sacrificed to Baal or Moloch (which means King).

If the eucharist is derived from the "meal after death" (*dapes post mortem*) which the bereaved arranged in the honor of the deceased after his death, the meal may originally have been a viaticum for his journey into eternity, although they ate the bread and drank the wine vicariously for him. But they are for him, not of him. But this main rite (the eucharist) proves that not the life or the teachings of the messiah, but his death is the main event of Christianity and this is logical, because he redeemed the faithful not by his life, but by his death, erasing thereby their sins or their original sin and restored the immortality lost by Adam. To achieve this he needed a twofold nature, human and divine. A human one, because otherwise he could not die (sacrifice himself) to redeem the faithful, and a divine one, because otherwise he could not rise from the dead and promise resurrection to his followers. His death is voluntary – as he is divine – those who brought him to death are accused nevertheless, because he suffered like a man. There is here of course a contradiction, because if the death was necessary, how should it be performed without killing? Since eternal life after death is the substance of the Hellenistic messianic faith, all feasts adopted by Christianity from Jewry were in some way now readapted and

connected with the death or resurrection of the Xristos. This is true of Passah (Easter), of Whitsuntide, as for the Day of Atonement, readapted as the Day of Judgment, as the second coming of Christ. This is an agreement with the symbolic interpretation of the Pentateuch by Philon.

The idea of the original sin of Adam presupposes of course that Adam, Eve, Abel and Cain are historical, not mythical personalities. It seems that Adam was originally some subterrestrial deity like Pluto. Adama means earth, something like Hades and "dam" means blood. As for Eve (Havah) her name means "The Living One" and she is obviously a worshipper of a snake, an earth goddess. Adam could have been driven from the Eden, because he worshipped also a snake (nahash), (women means nashim). Whether Eve is also a sort of Demeter (Dea Mater) is impossible to say. The Jewish religious literature was reworked at a later date, so that the original mythological polytheistic deities are changed into human personalities, patriarchs, prophets, leaders of the people. In the first place the plural "elohim" is translated into singular despite its different grammatical form. It was mentioned that Elijah and Elisha meant a divine couple, not a prophet and his disciple. The Jews were a Canaanite people and spoke a Canaanite language and their religious history shows a continuous struggle between the worshippers of the Canaanite Baal and Astrate, and the God Yahuah who was probably the god of the Judeans, while the Northerners preferred Baal and Astarte.

The place of origin

The main problem of the origin of Christianity is perhaps the main historical problem of this faith. The gospel of St. John shows that the intellectual origin was in Alexandria, while the first communities must have also arisen in Alexandria and in Rome. This is also proved by the archeological remnants of Christianity which find themselves in Roman catacombs. Since there are also Jewish catacombs there and in Sicily (Syracuse) a subterranean synagogue with an exit to the sea was discovered, the Christian catacombs are no speciality, they are simply places

of burial and prayer hidden from the eyes of the pagans that could persecute or otherwise disturb their prayers or acts of worship. Since these are, however, places of burial, there might be another reason. The Jews as well as Christians believed in the resurrection of the bodies as form of immortality. Under these conditions they needed subterranean ways for the resurrected bodies, and these were provided by the catacombs. As the Christians believed that the end of the world and therefore the resurrection was near, the catacombs were the logical place for this need. Those who would believe that the invisible soul only survives, not the body, do not need catacombs as burial places. The catacombs of Rome are therefore an archaeological proof of the origin of Christianity in the West, namely in Rome, and not in the East, in Palestine. The Greek language of the New Testament is an additional and still more important proof, because this was not the language of Palestine or Jerusalem. The gospels and the epistles of the NT are not addressed to the people of Palestine, but to Hellenistic population. No eye witness of the messiah and of the miracles performed by him wrote the gospels. These are stories circulating about him which conformed to the alleged prophecies about him in the Old Testament.

He had to sacrifice himself in order to redeem mankind, not the Jewish people, but this sacrifice was expressed in the gospels in a materialistic way, first as a trial by the Romans and by a preceding betrayal by a Jew, called symbolically Judas — i.e. Jew — and after the trial killed by the insistence of the Jews, despite the good will of the Romans. Everything bad was therefore attributed to the Jews by a Hellenistic Oriental who wrote the story, and was an ethnic enemy of the Jews. Thus if Moses liberated the Jews from servitude in Egypt, the messiah did his redemption of all mankind from mortality. If Je(ho)schuah led the Jews from the desert to the Holy Land, another Jeshuah was the liberator from death and the number of his disciples was Twelve, the same as that of the tribes of Israel. This was obviously a holy number. The messiah liberated mankind from death. This is the sense of the triumphal exclamation: "Death is swallowed up in victory. O death, where is thy victory? O death, where is thy sting? (1 Cor. 54-55.). The author of this

epistle is very sure that resurrection and eternal life are the rewards of the messianic faith, when he says: "For if the dead rise not, then is not Christ raised, and if Christ be not raised, your faith is vain, ye are yet in your sins ..." (1 Cor. 15, 16-17). Christianity is therefore the belief in eternal life and if there is none, the faith is vain. If Passah is the feast of liberation from servitude in Egypt, Easter is that of liberation of servitude to death. It is the belief in eternal life, it means elevating liberation from a national to a universal level and it was what the Hellenistic populations desired most eagerly. As for the Jewish population in Palestine, it was at that moment more concerned with the need of liberation from the Roman rule. That was not the concern of the Hellenistic populations of Rome and Alexandria. But neither Rome nor Alexandria could be the site of Anointedness, this was reserved for the far distant Judea.

The literary origin of crucifixion

The question as to why the Xristos was allegedly put to death by crucifixion has as main answer the grammatical fact that the word Xristos begins in Greek with a X (khi) and that this is pictorially speaking a cross. The word Xristos suggested by its initial the kind of death. In addition this letter resembles the old last letter of the Hebrew alphabeth namely "Thav" (th) and this letter has a similar form as X. Now thav means "cross" or "sign". These grammatical facts suggested the kind of death the Xristos was subjected to. In addition it was historically the kind of death to which the sadistic Romans subjected their slaves and the Christians of Rome were to a large extent themselves slaves or freedmen (liberti). And it is very characteristic that the writers of these gospels affirm that the Xristos was killed for religious reasons as a blasphemer, but they use a Roman as intermediary for this killing and let the Xristos be killed in a way repugnant to and unknown to Jewish law which knows only stoning. The whole proceedings of this socalled trial show its historical improbability and even impossibility. The trial story is a means of exculpating the Romans and accusing the Jews, because they rejected the messianic story. It is an anti-

Jewish propaganda war. The eucharist not only celebrates the death of the Xristos i.e. the most important event in the messianic story, it has an important function, because the body of the Messiah replaces as place of worship the Temple of Jerusalem. This function was very important outside of Israel. The worship in the Temple consisted mainly of two services: of placing the shewbreds and the Highpriest controlled from time to time obviously whether the deity accepted them, and 2) of the bloody sacrifices of the animals, i.e. of their blood. All sacrifices were replaced by the messiah, by his supreme sacrifice, they became superfluous after his death. And his sacrifice of the body, symbolically in the form of bread, and of his blood, symbolically in the form of red wine, could replace those sacrifices of shewbreads and of animal blood in the Temple. Thus the self-immolation of the Xristos rendered the Temple of Jerusalem superfluous. The destruction of the Temple by the Romans was not a punishment for the killing of the messiah, the Temple was rendered unnecessary by the reinterpreted Jewish faith. If the Xristos states in the Gospel of St. John that he will rebuild the Temple in three days, it means that he will be resurrected in three days, so that he replaces the Temple. The cleaning of the Temple by the messiah initiates its abolishment.

The story of the messiah is not a historical event, but a sort of theoretical religious necessity, if the redemption of mankind should be accomplished. The incarnation of the Logos, the self-immolation of the incarnated Logos and his ascent to heaven à la Elijah or disappearance à la Moses are no historical events, because none of these stages was visible, where it was told. It was a report of miraculous events as miraculous as the resuscitation of Lazarus, the giving of vision to a born blind, the multiplication of wine or of bread. Just as through the cutting off of the ear of a soldier by the alleged sword-bearer Simon Petrus and the instantaneous healing of the ear, nothing was changed in the world, the incarnation of the Logos did not happen on earth. It coincided with the destruction of the Jewish people and of the Temple in Jerusalem. Those Jews have at the moment of confrontation with the Romans other concerns, than a messiah who was not from this world. They could not have been concerned with such imaginary "trials" of the

orthodoxy of one member of their community. The cock did not crow and the curtain of the Temple was not torn at the immolation of the Xristos. It was torn and burned by the Romans and this rendered possible to a consecutive bishop, episkopos or mevaker of Rome to assume the seat of the Pontifex maximus and to usurp at the same time the cap, the tiara, the white vestments, the whole headgear of the Jewish High-priest. The Romans became through their political and military achievements the main supporters of the messianic religion and they rendered impossible through their destructive work any control of what happened or did not happen in Judea, because everything was destroyed there already in 70 A.D. and Hadrian completed the destruction fifty years later after the uprising of Bar-Kochba. The formation of the messianic faith coincided with these catastrophic events and this was no accident. The Logos-philosophy and the incarnation of the Logos were a Hellenistic concept and when this philosophy of the Logos and its incarnation were accepted, more than 300 years i.e. ten generations after the so-called event, there was not even a trace in Palestine of what happened at such an early date. The Trinity theory of the Nicaean Council – the first council of the new faith – accepted a Trinitarian faith, that means the Holy Ghost was added to the Logos, his Father to form one of the ancient trinities, for instance that of three patriarchs who probably were also gods. But the Holy Ghost – the “pneuma hagion” – was nothing else than the breath of God, the “ruah hakodesh” which dwelt with predilection as the so-called “she-hina” – (the Dwelling of God) in the Temple of Jerusalem. The Temple having disappeared, it could be added safely to the idea of God, forming three invisible entities or elements of Divinity. In the Gospel of St. John 16, 7-15 the Xristos declares to his disciples that it is good for them that he returns to his Father, because he will send a Paraclete (Comforter, Helper) who will judge the world and punish the sinners. This shows that his death is not the result of a conspiracy, but rather an integral part of the redemption. He could not send the Paraclete without returning to his Father. But if he declares at the end that he has overcome the world and tells during his trial, that he is not from this world, this may be also interpreted that his

personal story has no terrestrial reality, i.e. that it did not happen in history. In fact the end of all personalities indicated in the gospels is vague. What happened for instance to Lazarus after he rose from the dead? The Jews wanted allegedly kill him too. Did they? What and where was the end of all the apostles? No trace of their existence was ever left in Judea. In Qumran remnants of an ascetic opposition to the establishment of Jerusalem were found, but none concerning the transformation of the Logos into flesh or into a messiah. That was created in the Hellenistic world, i.e. in Alexandria.

The messianic faith has really two birthdays of the Xristos, one is the epiphany of the Logos which was replaced by a more colorful birth in Bethlehem with the adoration of a trinity of kings – the parallel of the three Jewish patriarchs – but in hiding from Herodes in a stable, while the epiphany of the Logos did not lend itself to Romantic coloring. The gospel “kata Ioannen” is the most philosophical of the gospels, but also the most complicated one. Here the Xristos promises to send a Paracletos who is scarcely the Holy Ghost – as is assumed, because he is also the World Judge – he really completes the redemptory process which the Xristos brings about through his sacrifice, but without that sacrifice or self-immolation there is no redemption. On the other hand this redemption must be achieved by the punishment of sinners through the Ruler of the world. This is what the Paraclete achieves. But he cannot achieve it before the self-sacrifice of the messiah nor can that redemption be achieved before his death. Therefore his death is good as he tells his disciples, because only then can the messianic process come to its fruition. It cannot come thereto during his earthly life. The world is redeemed through the death of the Xristos and it is only then that his helper – the Paracletus – can come down and judge the world as the completion of the messianic redemption.

There is a supererogatory number of place names concerning the origin and the birth of the Xristos. A town Nazareth did not exist but it could be invented, since the Lake Genezareth might suggest it as Ge-Nazareth, if there is no question of Nasir or holy man. If the genealogies making him an Anointed one suggested royal birth and King David as an ancestor, the birth in Bethlehem

was not necessary, although the name is of course more prestigious than Galilee. If a sort of novel was written about the Xristos, this sort of confusion is possible, especially if we think that the Logos has scarcely any place on earth for its transmutation into Flesh.

The Works of the Apostles

The "Praxeis Apostolon" must be a title of a later date since this is mainly a story of Shaul or Paul, who originally did not belong to the Twelve. On the other hand those Twelve are rather called (for instance in the gospel of St. John "mathetai" i.e. disciples, not apostles. They are no apostles, i.e. messengers sent out by the Xristos to convert mankind. Their number 12 is wholly mythical, it corresponds to the just as mythical twelve tribes of Israel, so that for every tribe there is one apostle and Shaul or Paul the thirteenth, is for the conversion of the non-Jews. With the exception of Paul not one is really sent out to reach and convert and how could they, if they are depicted as simple fishermen? Their personalities are vague and their end is unknown. Only the life of the thirteenth who was no disciple of the living Xristos is described more fully but equally mythically. The story of St. Paul is a repetition of the Story of Bileam combined with the story of the Xristos, even the "trials" of Jesus is duplicated, the alleged trial in Rome is preceded by a trial of a Jewish King. One of the literary reasons, why the death of the Xristos is preceded by a trial and he is killed in the form of crucifixion is that in this form his end became understandable to the common man. As appearance and disappearance of the Logos it would not be understandable. But since the whole story of the messiah (especially in St. Luke and St. John) is a string of miracles that culminates in the resuscitating of Lazarus from death, the trial and the death on the cross belong to the miracles that did not happen on earth, but merely assume the form of human happenings for reasons of communicability. Neoplatonism of Plotinus was not only a late and more vulgarized form of Platonism, but since it excluded the transformation of the Logos into a messiah and avoided names of deity, it could not

promise selective immortality to mankind, it merely exchanged creation for emanation. It could therefore not become a true competitor to the apostolic religion. But the latter also changed profoundly its character. From a belief in a world judge and Pantocrator or World Ruler it became after the Islamic conquest of the Christian East a belief into a God crucified and bleeding from mortal wounds. All the attempts to write a biography of Jesus on the basis of the gospel material were doomed to failure, because little is left, if the miraculous element is excluded, beside some critique of the Jerusalem establishment and of the Jews in general, of quotations from the Old Testament converted into biographical data, such for instance as the entry into Jerusalem on an ass. As for the greeting with palm branches (hoshanah, osanna means palm) it seems that Pessah is confused with Sukoth in the autumn, when there is a Palm festival called Hoshana Rabba, and people greet themselves in shaking palm branches. The realistic elements are the trial and the death. The commands of such ceremonies as the eucharist are put into the mouth of the messiah to add to their sacredness. He is also predicting the destruction of the Temple in Jerusalem as punishment for the obstinacy of the Jews, but the order of historical events was just in reverse, it was the destruction of Jerusalem and of the Temple that rendered the victory of the apostolic faith possible. Therein the Romans were the unknowing allies of the messianic faith. The explicitness and the detailed description of the gospels are in reverse proportion of the historical distance from the event, although it should have been the opposite. The so-called Luke, the most distant from the synoptics is the most explicit i.e. the most fictional. The biographers tried to construct a biography of the Xristos on the basis of fiction. If St. Paul describes himself in the "Letter to the Romans" "doulos Iesou Christou", this is nothing else than a literal translation of the honorific title of Moses "Mosheh ebed JHVH" – Moses the servant of the Lord. The bulk of the Jews did not accept the Philonian philosophy and still less the transformation of the Logos into a man which was a pagan concept alien to Judaism. As for the main hope of the messianic faith, the resurrection after death, the community of saints was obviously plagued by doubts on the subject. This is shown by

the personification of that doubt into Thomas Didymus in the gospel of St. John and in the doubts expressed by the first letter to the Corinthians as quoted above.

Although there are 12 apostles or messengers (in Hebrew: shiloach-shelihim) of the apostolic faith, only two acquire prominence — Shimon-Petrus — and the self-appointed missionary to the Gentiles Shaul-Pavlos. But Shimon did not convert the Jews and Paul was on his trips in Athens where he speaks in a Jewish synagogue, although Athens had neither a Jewish community nor a synagogue in antiquity or in the Middle Ages. To whom has he really spoken? His braving a storm at sea and discussions with the seamen remind of the story of the prophet Jonah of which it is a paraphrase. But both Petrus and Paul have a tradition of being in Rome, where important churches are dedicated to them, although "The Acts of the Apostles" do not mention any voyage of Peter. But it may be some truth in the assumption that the two main propagandists of the apostolic faith lived in the ancient world capital. No Jew had in antiquity the name Paulus, but many had the name Apella (credat Judaeus Apella is a satiric saying). Apella may be the Hebrew Abel. Apella has the same number of letters as Paulus. Was he perhaps one of the Jewish expellees under the Emperor Claudius? Apella is more similar to Paulos than Sha-ul. Perhaps the writer of the "Acts of the Apostles" Loukas, not Paulos, was from Tarsus. This was no Jewish city and the teacher-philosopher of Octavian Augustus, Athenodoros, was from Tarsus. This is its title to greatness and the Emperor raised it to the status of a metropolis. But there are two important words in the new faith, "paschein" which means "to suffer" in Greek, but suggests the Hebrew "Pessah"-meaning "to cross over" but intimating the suffering of the messiah. "Tharsein" means "to comfort". Is perhaps the converter of the Gentiles from the city of Comfort? As Philon called the Logos "Son of God" and such a son was even mentioned in the Psalms, his epiphany among humans was easy. Such "epiphanes" was in general of royal birth, i.e. an Anointed one, i.e. a messiah. Of course the meaning of the Anointed one as Redeemer of Israel, was completely different from a pagan epiphanes, but the votaries of the apostolic faith took recourse in their interpretation of scriptures,

to the literal meaning of the figures of speech – hence also of the “Son of God”. This form of interpretation was opposite to that of Philon. Now the Anointed one must have been thought in Judea, but he could not be a Herodian, because Herodes was from the House of Edom, not from the House of Jacob, therefore they had to look for a descendant of David, unknown, but existent somewhere. Neither Hasmoneans nor Herodians could purvey such an Anointed one. If St. Paul is a mythical person, his name must have a symbolic meaning and it has. I assume that Shaul was not the primary name, but rather Apella which was transformed into Pavlos which suggested Shaul, the name of the first King of Israel and a Benjaminite. This is a honorific appellation which begins in addition with a letter “shin” like that of Shimon Petrus and both of them remind of “shem” the name of God, and also of “Shemesh” (sun) and “sheol” (the Hades, the underground). The symbolism goes further. If Jesus was a “son” of King David, St. Paul bears the name of his predecessor King Shaul, the first king of Israel. As for Pavlos, P. Aemilius Paullus was the Roman conqueror of Greece and this Paulus was its converter to the faith of the saints. His place of origin was logically outside of Palestine in the city rendered famous by Caesar Augustus. He was not merely an Apella, he was a Paulus. Maybe the author of the “Acts of the Apostles” was himself from Tarsus. He honored the converter of the Greeks with a sub-gospel, the only apostle that could boast such a honor, although he was not one of the Twelve. But this was never considered and the churches of Peter and Paul show that they were considered equals. There are only three persons apart from the Xristos Jesus, who are distinguished in a similar way in the gospel literature; St. John the Baptist, St. Peter and St. Paul. John the Baptist is the only historical figure among them who may have suggested the person of the Xristos, the others are largely fictional. The Xristos Jesus is a literary ideal like Don Quijote or Dr. Faust, perhaps the first personality of this kind, if Greek mythology is left out. It is a human archetype. St. Paul is a sort of Bileam of the New Testament. He went out to curse and denounce, but he finished by believing, and adoring. His own conversion is miraculous, it is not a simple discipleship.

He is a scion of a non-Judean Gentile city, close to Ephesus, the holy city of Artemis. He is called a Benjaminite, a countryman of King Shaul and bears his name at a time when there were no more Benjaminites. The Jews undertook no missionary travels like Paul, Heracles and Oidipous traveled on holy missions. The gospels try to explain, why the Xristos was never present on earth, because a Jew betrayed him and his compatriots delivered him impiously to the pagans. He died therefore on the cross. The end of Paul was left undetermined, but according to tradition he was beheaded also by the Romans. Yet the Romans are exculpated and the Jews are excoriated and this is understandable from a historical point of view, not from a logical one. While the Xristos is the personification of messianism, Paul is the personification of apostolate activity. Paul's protestations of his Jewishness are supposed to prove that by his birth he was not apt to see the truth of messianism, but he is also the one who abolishes the circumcision and the dietary laws of the Jews, two mainstays of their religion. That circumcision was considered as the main rite of Judaism, is proved by the action of Emperor Hadrian, who prohibits it in order to destroy Judaism after the Bar-Kochba uprising. Of course, it was not St. Paul, who was the author of such abolitions of Jewish customs, but the discussions between Paul and Peter in Damascus on the subject of Jewish customary observances are a dramatization of the scissions inside the community of saints. The elimination of the prepuce replaced probably originally the offering of the whole male child to the gods of which the story of Isaac is obviously a historical remembrance.

Paul is a personification of the itinerant preachers-philosophers familiar in the Hellenistic world, he is not the type of a sedentary Jewish scholar. Platon states in the "Symposion" in the discussions between Diotima and Socrates that the ground of love is the desire of immortality and it is shared by the animal world. But he achieves immortality naturalistically by procreation, Paul achieves it supernaturalistically by resurrection after death. But this is a proof of the Hellenistic origin of the Christogene faith.

The "Praxeis Apostolon" do not describe any "act" of the apostles, but merely a part of the life of the thirteenth apostle

who was none. In the same way the gospels do not describe the life, but the death of the messiah. The names of the alleged authors of the three synoptic gospels begin with L and M. Now the Hebrew letter L (lamed) contains already both letters and the Hebrew letters M (mem) contains already two M., the initials of Markos and Matthaios, while the three letters LMD mean in Hebrew "to teach". KLM are the three main initials of the gospels (Xristos, kerygma, para-cletos etc. They refer to messianism, while Jo-papers (St. John, Johanan etc.) rather refer to epiphany and to Egypt and Alexandria. These papers include also the Apocalypse and are important for the question of the possible identification of Jesus and St. John the Baptist.

The conversion and the ordination of St. Paul by a vision of the Xristos show that he was ordained by nobody and that the conversion of the Gentiles was a work of God.

The preface to St. Luke's gospel addressed to the anonymus and symbolic Theophilus shows not only that he is not going to report facts, but to tell a story, but that he was aware of that.

His hero St. Paul is a personage full of contradiction. He was allegedly a Roman citizen, but his alleged birth place Tarsus became a Roman city juridically in 66 A.D. i.e. shortly before the outbreak of the great Jewish-Roman war that ended with the destruction of Jerusalem and its Temple. In 66 A.D. Paul was already a very old man. When did he acquire the Roman citizenship and why? It is thought of course as a honorific status and this was allegedly the reason, why he was not crucified, but beheaded. But did any Jews live in Tarsus? It had even two philosophers as magistrates, Nestor and Athenadoros, the latter of whom was a teacher of Caesar Augustus. Was this honor a reason, why the converter of the Hellenes was made a scion of Tarsus? Close to Tarsus was Ephesus with the Temple of Artemis, whose priestesses were called Melittai (bees). Was this a reason, why Paulus landed in Melitta (Malta) on his last trip to Rome? Was he perhaps one of the Jewish expellees from Rome under Emperor Claudius and returned to Rome from Tartessus in Spain via Melitta-Malta? Spain is called in Hebrew Tarshish. His Letter to the Romans was not written in Latin, but in Greek, it was addressed to the Greek speaking population in Rome.

The messianic cult was, however, not one of the Oriental

cults like that of Mithra or Isis embraced by the Hellenistic world, but on the contrary, the most recent and the most modern Hellenistic cult, which issuing from Hellenistic Rome conquered the Hellenistic East, especially Asia Minor and Egypt. It had behind it a base in the richest religious literature, namely in the Septuagint. It created its own history, its own sacred events and its own holidays. Its Xristos came at the time of Emperor Tiberius and its messiah and apostles lived around the lake of Tiberias. It was so to speak a Roman institution. The fact that a trial has been made the centre of the messianic story which reads like an act of accusation of the Jews, is one of the proofs of the Roman origin of this literature, because it was in Rome that judicial proceedings and oratorical fireworks had such a fame as the life of Cicero shows. This was not the case in Judea. The story of St. Paul which is a rehash of the biblical story of Bileam, of the fate of the prophet Jonah and of the life of Jesus himself also centers on trials, first by a Jewish king and then by the Caesar himself. The authors of the Jesus story made out of a story of redemption a story of terrestrial court proceedings on a Roman model. In reading the gospels one would think that Christianity was primarily directed against the Jews, but this was not the case: the Jews might have been, however, its main competitors, not opponents. The "Letter to the Romans" and the "Apocalypse" show that it was directed against Roman and Greek paganism. But this conflict had a sense in Rome, not in Jerusalem, because there were no pagans there. What the Jews are reproached for is that they are not sincere believers, that they do not fulfill the prescriptions of their own law, that they are impious. The gospels which were composed to explain the death of the Xristos, accuse the Jews in the first place. But although neither doctrially nor locally are there any documents or remnants of Christianity in Judea, the Jews enter the picture, because the messiah was supposed to live and to die in Judea.

But the messianism conceived in Alexandria and popularized in Rome was not tailored to the needs of the Jews of Palestine which required first of all political, not spiritual remedies, liberation from Roman rule. This is a point non-existent in the New Testament literature. The main competitors of the saints

among the Jews were just the Pharisees whom they oppose so bitterly. The Pharisees believed in resurrection after death so that the main attraction of the messianic faith for the pagans was non-existent for the Jews. And it is just this main point of the messianic faith, eternal life after death, the alpha and omega of Christianity that is lacking in effectiveness insofar the Jews were concerned, because post-exilic Phariseism had such a faith. And this is the main proof that this form of messianism could not have arisen in Judea.

The main difference between the intellectual life of Jews and pagans in antiquity was that the former centered around theology and the latter around poetry, philosophy and science. Thus to the pagans the Jews were ignorant barbarians and the pagans to the Jews nations ignorant of God and his moral precepts. The Jewish religious life centered around the Temple in Jerusalem. Its sanctissimum was the abode of the Holy Ghost, the "ruah hakodesh" in Hebrew; spiritus sanctus in Latin, and pneuma hagian in Greek. The trinitarian theory of original Christianity leaves God and his breath (pneuma hagian) as two elements of Divinity and adds the messiah as third element. He was human, if he had to die and was divine, if he was resurrected. He was to die, if he was to represent the human beings and be resurrected, if they were to gain his immortality. This is a logical construction. The body of the messiah then replaced the Temple of Jerusalem, the blood of its animal victims which represent human beings and shewbreads laid out originally for the Deity and controlled as to its response by the highpriest. When the Temple was destroyed, the Holy Ghost departed from Israel and therefore the Jewish religion became truncated and frustrated. The loss of the Temple was therefore the loss of the abode of God, therefore the eternal lamentations at the Wailing Wall and elsewhere. The Christian messiah had to die and had to be resurrected, to accomplish his mission on earth, i.e. restore immortality to mankind i.e. eternal life after death. The Jewish Messiah as envisioned in the Old Testament had to renew the glory of Israel, to abolish death and to establish eternal peace on earth. To achieve this, he had not necessarily to die as had the Xristos. The latter was identified with the innocent lamb that is sacrificed at Easter, thus he had to die at

Easter as the Innocent Lambo of God.

The apostolic Christ-faith has only marginal elements of Judaism, while Judaism has only marginal elements of messianism, the latter's origin being probably not Jewish at all. Judaism has no idea of salvation or redemption, only pagans needed them, not believers in God. What the Hellenistic antiquity evolved itself and accepted, was a salvational epiphany of a half-god with a human face who secured for man eternal life. This form of neo-judaism fitted the needs of the pagan world, but not those of the Jews of Jerusalem. When the latter city disappeared, the apostolic faith invented a heavenly Jerusalem and called itself the true Israel. The destruction of the Temple of Jerusalem made place for a neo-judaic reformation and a truncated Judaism. Neo-judaism eliminated all specific Jewish laws that governed Jewish life such as circumcision of the males and the dietary laws and adopted only those that are respected by all religions, and the laws on sexuality that prohibit adultery and perversions. Eternal life after death is not necessarily a Jewish belief. This eternity of life assumed the form of resurrection of the bodies and the Christian as well as Jewish catacombs testify to this form of eternal life. If risen the bodies could use the subterranean ways. The writers of the gospels must have been enemies of traditional Jewry, otherwise they would not have bestowed the symbolic name of Jew (Judas) on the traitor of the messiah, a sort of Ephialtes. It is interesting in this connection that Judith that killed the alleged Holofernes bears the same name and she killed Holofernes treacherously. Holofernes is not a Babylonian, but a Greek name and reminds one of the Greek Tissafernes, who served the Persian King as governor of a province and was perhaps for that reason hated or despised by the Greeks. Who invented Judith? She is a replica of the woman that killed Sisera.

The Moyzes myth is accompanied by the exodus of the Hebrews from Egypt, the land of slavery, to Judea, the land of liberty. The birth of the messiah is accompanied by the exodus from Judea into Egypt. Not Judea, but Egypt is here the land of liberty and salvation. This is similarity by contrast: Moyzes-Xristos, and Egypt was really the home of the Philonian Logos-Son of God. The Moyzes myth is a paraphrase of the myth

about Isis and Osiris, it is only humanized and the Isis is replaced by the daughter of the Pharaoh. Isis without its Greek ending is the same word as Isha or Issa (according to the pronunciation of the letter shin and sin. Thus the masculine of Isha is in Hebrew Ish (man) or male god. It is contained in the name Issachar which means probably another god. Osiris is probably Asser. Osher or Osseter means *rich*. In the word Lazarus which is a form of Eleazar the word Asser or Osseter is contained "El-Asser". Although Moyzes is an Egyptian name, it must not be given in Egypt and Canaan was for some time under Egyptian rule so that liberation from it meant perhaps expulsion of Egyptians, not necessarily exodus from Egypt. The "Ibrim" or the people of Ab-raham, came probably from the Aramaean North. This is suggested by the description of the land of Israel "from Dan to Beersheba" i.e. from North to South, not in the opposite direction. Perhaps the tribe of Levi, the great tribe of Moyzes and Aharon (perhaps the other man) and their "elated" sister "Mariam" came from the South. The involvement of Israel with Egypt is unmistakable. Daniel is the "God of Dan", of the region Dan, not of a man Dan. Michelangelo depicts (sculpts) Moyzes with two horns at the forehead, but the god Baal was imagined in such form. In the formulation of the gospel Moyzes is the lawgiver and the Xristos the purveyor of Grace, however, the God of the Old Testament is also "el rahamim" the merciful or charitable God.

The Greek literature of the New Testament is written mostly by Hellenistic Orientals who were ethnic enemies of the Jews. The latter were massacred in Lybia, Egypt etc. Loukas is certainly such an Oriental. He imagines pro-Greek meetings of Paul in Athens and lauds Greek broadmindedness, while he criticizes the superstitious Jews, a critique which was usual in Rome (Credat Judaeus Apella). If we scrutinize the names Paul or Pavlos, we should not forget the similarity of Pavlos (Paulus) and Baal. Baal means not only the God Baal, but also man, Lord. The gospel "Kata Ioannen" has an expression "ribboni", with which the sister of Lazarus addresses the Xristos whose feet are anointed. It should be mentioned that the Jews use the expression "Ribboni shel olam" (My Lord of the World), when they exclaim: "Oh my God".

The deep involvement of the Hebrews in things Egyptian, most apparent in the name of Moshe who is called until today "Moshe Rabenu" (Our teacher Moses). Mosheh is similar in tone and writing to "Meshiah" (Xristos) and the parallel Mosheh-Xristos is evident in the story of the Xristos in the New Testament, first of all in matter of his birth and flight to Egypt. Apart from this the name Mosheh is formed with the letter "mem" as the initial and in the word Mosheh this should be analyzed as Me-ishah "out of a woman" or "out of Isis" which is linguistically the same. This is what "Mosheh" means as "son". But whose son is he? Probably not of Amram and Jochebed which are largely symbolic names, but of the goddess Isis (Issah). Related to these names is the goddess Ashtara or Ashtoreth in Canaan and Ishtar in Babylon. The Hebrew Esther has the same root, but here the letter "shin" becomes "sin". The son of Isis is called Horus and the mountain from which Moses receives the tablets of law is called Choreb or Horab which contains the names Hor and "ab" which means father but also god, who is a father of men. This word is contained in Abraham, in Ja'cob. In the Exodus Moses asks God in whose name he should speak to Pharaoh and ask him for the release of the Jews. He asks in whose name he should speak, i.e. how this God is called. This shows that when this was written, the Hebrews believed that there are also other gods and that theirs is not the only god. God answers: in the name of the gods of Abraham, in the name of the gods of Isaac and of the gods of Ja'cob. The gods are named in plural "elohe". There follows the celebrated spot Ex. 3,14: Eïeh asher eïeh (I am which I am – Ego sum qui sum – Je suis celui qui est). This was the object of a commentary "Dieu et L'Etre" (Recherches du Centre d'Etude des Religions du Livre, Ecole Pratique des Hautes Etudes, 5e section, Paris, 1978).

In my opinion the philosophical interpretations of this passage on the basis of some philosophy of being is untenable: The word "eïeh" has in Hebrew the four letters as the usual name of God JHVH, (Iah)-Yahveah and it may contain the same divine couple as the word JHVH, namely the male god Iah and the female god Ah. Then JHVH would be read Yah and Ah. In the Old Testament there is one such couple mentioned, namely

Eliyahu and Elisha(h) who are changed for reasons of monotheism into prophet and his disciple. But Eliyahu is not dead, he is still expected to visit Jewish homes at the Passah seder (Easter meal). Then perhaps Eliyahu was the deity that led the Hebrews out of Egypt. And they expect Him to return.

In its present form the passage has no definite sense and it would be improper to seek in it philosophical meanings. It should be in the first place an answer to a question. As such it would lack sense. Those who changed the original wording, wanted probably to cover up the polytheism contained in this statement. In this case perhaps the word "which" (asher) is really no pronoun but a remnant of something else, perhaps a name "Asser" or "Osser" (Osiris). At present this is not decidable, but the previous passage shows that the gods of Israel have sent Moyses to Pharaoh and this passage should merely elucidate who they were, their name. At the time of the translation of the Old Testament into Greek, this passage had already the present form, because Philon knew it, but whether it was influenced by Greek speculations on Being is impossible to say.

Quo vadis

How deeply Roman tradition assumed that the apostle Peter-Simon was living in Rome, is shown by the little "Quo vadis" church in the environs of the city. When Peter wanted to flee from Rome to avoid persecution, the Xristos Jesus appeared to him at this spot. Peter then asked him: Quo vadis, Domine? (Where do you go, Lord?) and Jesus answered: "Vado Romam, iterum crucifigi" (I go to Rome, to be crucified once more). Peter ashamed turned back to Rome (where he was crucified). The remarkable thing in the answer of Jesus is that it sounds as if he were crucified for the first time not in Jerusalem but in Rome. Neither the fisherman from the Lake Tiberias nor the Xristos from Galilee spoke Latin and none of them could meet in Rome, but the tradition shows how deeply ingrained was in Rome the tradition that the suburbs of this city were the origin of the apostolic faith.

If the alleged epistles of St. Paul are taken as the confirmation of the Canaanite origin of the faith of the saints and the personage of Paul is taken as a historical one, this is entirely erroneous, this is one myth, the Pauline, added to another one, the myth of the Xristos. The life of the thirteenth apostle as told by the "Acts of the Apostles" is entirely fictional. His sudden illumination by a vision, his stay in the desert à la St. John the Baptist, his persecution by the Jews à la Jesus himself, his trials in the courts etc. without any real accusation, his honorific two names, one of the first King of Israel, the other of the conqueror of the Greeks, his origin from a city which boasted to have furnished the teacher of Caesar Octavian Augustus and which was promoted by him to the status of a metropoli — all this is novelistic. It is rather probable that the author of the "Acts" was from Tarsus and later dwelt in Rome among the proselytes of messianism. He conferred upon Paul the dignity of the apostle of the Gentiles. The latter was inveighing in the "Letter to the Romans", attributed to him, especially against homosexuality, lesbianism and other sexual aberrations, punishable by death in the Jewish law, but very common among Greeks and Romans.

*The problem of the origin and the
achievements of Christianity*

The main achievement of the apostolic faith was the replacement of a poetic mythology by a Hellenistic philosophical theory of deity and the foundation of morals on the latter. It also converted the parochial religion of the Jews into one that could have meanings for non-Jews. This was done by the symbolic interpretation of the Old Testament and of the Jewish holidays. The main feast became Pessah, which was originally the most joyous Jewish festival, but now acquired the form of the immolation of the Lamb of God and the resurrection of the messiah. This was naturally more interesting for non-Jews, than the exodus from Egypt. The liberation of the Jews from Egyptian slavery becomes liberation from death and attainment of immortality after death. Thus the feast is one of death and

resurrection, the latter being more important. The original sin of Adam is redeemed by the blood of the messiah and symbolically repeated by the eucharist. The celebrants do not drink the blood of Passah lamb nor do they eat its flesh, they drink the red wine and the unleavened bread as symbols of the blood and flesh of the Lamb of God. Thus a literary fact, the sin of the mythical Adam, becomes a real fact and gets a philosophical interpretation in the Hellenistic taste. It has no such importance in the Jewish tradition. These transformations have sense and importance for non-Jews and are construed according to the spiritual needs of the Hellenistic Gentiles. The form in which the Lamb of God is killed, is told in the form of a neo-Judaic Hagada. The story resembles most the miraculous stories of the prophets Daniel and Jonah. The main problem of the origin of the new faith is whether the place of origin was Rome or Jerusalem. The role of the philosophy of Philon, the idea of the Logos as "son" of God and its epiphany in a human person found in the messiah or Xristos shows clearly that Jerusalem had nothing to do with this origin, but Alexandria is intellectually and Rome practically its originator and promotor. Jerusalem had no Logos philosophy, it was neither intellectually outfitted nor had it the power and influence to launch this new religious theory. It had no prerequisites for it. As Jerusalem disappeared very soon from the face of the earth, the story of the Jesus trial and of Golgatha could be told without fear of any contradiction. Only then could it be affirmed that the destructions of the city and of the Temple and its spoliation were a punishment for his alleged death, but not before them.

The trial and the crucifixion of the messiah are not the main ingredients of the new religion, it is merely a literary adjunct to the incarnation of the Logos and the Logos as Son of God is the essential part of it. The incarnate Logos was found, because he was sought for. It was the Logos as Son of God who redeemed mankind, when he became embodied and died. The question whether Rome or Jerusalem was the origin of the new faith of the saints can be also determined on theoretical reasons. The conversion to the new ideas went from West to East and not vice-versa as it is generally supposed on the basis of the life of the Xristos. But this was an error, because he was not the

originator of the main basic idea of the apostolic faith, namely the incarnation of the Logos.

This presented the writers of the gospels with great difficulty. The incarnation of the Logos was not communicable, because it was mystical. The writers never saw the incarnate Logos, they were forced to use their own imagination. First the person of St. John the Baptist may have suggested itself as such embodiment, because this was a known historical figure. But he was not of royal descent, he could therefore not be an Anointed one nor was he resurrected. The writers had to use their own imagination to find an alleged incarnation of the Logos in a far-off country. It was certain that he was a holy, miraculous person, so he must have had a miraculous birth. Since he was a son of God, his terrestrial father was unnecessary and therefore the miraculous birth, from a virgin mother. Then there was a question what he said and did. He did miracles and said highly emotional pregnant things. His death was also miraculous, because it was not permanent, but issued in resurrection. If he was a Logos incarnate, he was everywhere and even antecedent to the world. He had St. John the Baptist as predecessor and the Paracletos, an advocate as successor who carried out his unfulfilled mission, the punishment of the disbelievers and setting the world straight. During his life he walked in triumph into Jerusalem and taught the people from the peak of mountains. We should not forget that the Hellenistic civilization knew one martyr who was also unjustly condemned by the people, but refused to avoid unjust punishment in order to uphold the sanctity of law and that this was one of the greatest thinkers of this civilization and the fate of the Xristos was similar, but adorned with positive signs of a divine order.

The founding of Christianity was not one act of one person, but a multiple work. The intellectual origin may be traced to Philon, but the man who exclaimed "Logos sarx egeneto" could have said so, when the alleged incarnation of the Logos was found or discovered. This clinched the whole process, because the epiphany was thereby conjoined with messianism. This was no Palestinian faith. It is and was the faith of the Greco-Roman Oicoumene imposed on the citizens of the Roman state by governmental fiat, when its members were already quite

numerous, especially in certain regions such as Asia Minor, Egypt or the city of Rome. When it penetrated Northern Europe outside France and the British Isles, it was already abolished in Asia Minor to a great extent, in Syria and partly in Egypt. It had already changed in the meantime its character. It was the religious worship of a Pantocrator in the beginning, of a triumphant resurrected deity, but it became after the conquests of the original bishoprics "in partibus infidelium" the belief in a crucified defeated God, who lost nothing of his holiness. When this faith penetrated Germany and the Slavic countries, it was already the belief in the crucified God with a further addition of the belief in his Divine Mother. This belief restored the old belief into a female Deity which was very powerful in the Semitic and in the so-called Aryan lands. In Rome the female holiness took the form of untouchability (immaculation), i.e. of virginity and the main church in Paris was not dedicated to any saint but to Notre Dame. The Divine Mother was primarily revered in Poland, but also in Austria, and in Russia. From the Byzantine East the Mother of God got a dark face on the mystic icon. The historical probability is that the apostolic faith was the work of Hellenized Orientals, a sort of popular pre-neo-platonism based on the theories of Philon. The gospels i.e. descriptions of the death of the epiphanes-Xristos are less biographies and more, as I said, accusations of the contemporary Jews, who waged war against the Romans and were universally detested by the Hellenized Orientals for their religious excentricity and pride. Palestine was a good region for the origin of the epiphanes, because the destructive Roman war obliterated all sources of local knowledge and history. Its Xristos or epiphanes was not the founder of the apostolic faith, he is a mythical personality with no proper name and his traditional name may mean Joshuah as well as salvation. The details of his life or his sayings are compiled from the Old Testament or quotations thereof. They are compiled quotations of other prophets or so-called prophecies post factum. A non-Jewish sort of death is inflicted on him by Jews and it would be interesting to investigate, whether this death on the cross was asserted before or after the destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans. The capture and destruction of

Jerusalem could in the latter case be interpreted as a punishment for his death, although the latter was imposed by the Romans as the accused Jews could not impose this impious method of killing. In this way the Romans become the unwilling instruments of the vilified Jews. All this shows that the authors of these "biographies" were more unfriendly to the Jews than to the Romans, although the apostolic faith was directed primarily against paganism.

Nobody can understand why Christianity has overpowered all Oriental religions and the native paganism, who does not understand the metaphysical promise of the apostolic faith: the promise of eternal life after death. The eucharist, the chief rite of the faith, provides the magical means of achieving it after the fashion the Xristos has achieved it. Little wonder then that when Reformation swept away the power of the orthodoxy, the main point of dissension remained always the form of the eucharist. The most ancient relics of Christianity – the catacombs of Rome – testify to the same fact and are also a proof that it was Rome that constituted the font of Christianity and that it did not spread from East to West, but vice versa. The catacombs are the cities of the dead and the streets the dead bodies would walk after their resurrection. The Jews did not believe that a man is composed of a body and a soul which may survive the death of the body. This is a Platonic belief. But the prophet Daniel declares that in the messianic age the dead bodies will rise to life again. Thus those Jews who believed in eternal life visualized it in the form of the resurrection of the bodies. This Jewish form of eternal life was taken over by the neo-Judaic votaries of messianism and hence catacombs dug for the dead. The Jews also had subterranean synagogues in Italy and Sicily to avoid molestation by the pagan world. And catacombs may have also be used for prayers. The catacombs provided room for the resurrected bodies. Since the believers into messianism did not think the end of the world far off, these places of refuge were of importance to them. The imperial Roman state was a worldly premonition of great things to come, of the end and the rebirth of the world through the Xristos.

The Messiah or Xristos is a composite character, he is a

synthesis of Moses and Joshuah; Moses brings the decalogue from Mount Horeb, the Xristos brings eternal life from the Mount of Olives before his triumphal entry into Jerusalem. Moses is threatened by the Pharaoh, the Xristos by Herodes, Moses flees from Egypt, the Xristos is saved in Hellenistic Egypt from a Judean King. The mother of the Xristos has the name of the sister of Moses and his terrestrial father has a name similar to that of Jo-hanan, it is Jo-seph, the name of the son of Jacob that ruled Egypt. He is a carpenter like Jesus himself and this is a paraphrase of the World-carpenter i.e. God himself.

Strictly speaking the Jewish God cannot produce an Epiphanes, but a Hellenistic can. The messiah is authenticated by his miraculous performances despite the fact, that the cosmic changes indicated as the end of the world did not occur. They are replaced by the indispensable miracles. As for the crucifixion, it is the prototype of the ethnic calumny (the bilbul) launched against the Jews in the Middle Ages so that they were not only money-grabbers, but also blood-stained murderers. These calumnies continued until the end of the 19th and the beginning of the 20th centuries were originally based on the crime of deicide – whatever that is.

Monograms and Symbols

The crucifix was by no means the original symbol of Christianity, but the fish. This is significant. It may be that the Xristos was also identified with the fish that swallowed the prophet Jonah and with the mystical Leviathan of "Hiob". If the Greek word for fish "ichthys" is taken as an addition of initials of the Greek words: Iesous Xristos Theou Hyios Soter, then this abbreviation is in the Jewish taste and tradition, but it proves the Hellenistic origin of the Iesous story and it is probably posterior to the original fish-symbol of the faith of the saints. But there is still another monogram of Christianity, namely the letter X divided by the Greek letter P (rho). Since the upper part of the letter P looks like a head and X is in itself a cross, the X and the P together $\text{X}\overline{\text{P}}$ may suggest crucifixion, so that the monogram would be the origin of the story of crucifixion, not

vice-versa. Whether the Philistinian deity Dagon (the god with fish-head) has anything to do with the symbol of Christianity, I do not know.

If the death on the cross was to be inflicted on the Xristos, the so-called trial was necessary, because the Jews considered this sort of killing as impious and did not use it. The Romans used it, but they considered this sort of death as dishonorable and it is such a kind of death that the writers of the messianic gospels wanted to impute to the Jews. To do this they needed the intercession of the Roman court, but since they wanted to accuse the Jews in the first place, they had to imagine a procedure or such happenings that could achieve both ends. These were the incitations of the Jewish mob addressed to the Procurator and asking him to condemn Jesus, and to kill him, although they had not the slightest reason of doing so, since they were no theologians, and could not understand, what it was all about. Christianity has no single authorship, it is a collective work of Hellenized Orientals and consists of two strains, a purely Hellenistic one and Hellenistic-Judean, specifically of epiphany and of messianism, whereby not messianism, but the Logos philosophy of epiphany is the primary source. They were both easily connected, but messianism lends itself more to popular understanding, meaning savior or redeemer, while epiphany means God, or rather Logos, incarnate, which is a more metaphysical concept. The latter concept existed among the Hellenized populations of Syria and Egypt and was transferred to Rome, since the Caesars bore the predicate "divus" which was accorded them by the Senate. Thus incarnation of Deity in a living man was not extraordinary, if he was a king or Caesar to achieve such a status. A messiah on the other hand means an Anointed one and this refers also to some form of kingship, a simple individual was not an Anointed one. In Palestine such individual could best be a descendant of the revered King David. Therefore we see that the authors of the gospels invent a genealogy of the messiah Jesus after the model "ele toldot Mosheh" (this is the descent of Moses) for instance.

The basic concept of Christianity with its Logos philosophy and epiphany shows, that its concept could not have arisen in Palestine, but in the Hellenized Jewish Diaspora, familiar with

the Septuagint, such as Alexandria in Egypt and Rome. No historian of the first destruction of the Jewish community in Jerusalem under Titus or of the following destruction under Hadrian mentions any role of a Christian community in Judea. The prerequisite of Christianity was the symbolic interpretation of the Old Testament as it was practiced by Philon. His Logos philosophy also became a constituent part of this new interpretation, which was a basic element of the apostolic faith. Alexandria was perhaps the main cultural center of the Hellenistic world as Rome became its political center. But Rome became also its cultural center. As such it became the pivot of the new faith. Judea could not play this role. It may have meant to the Jews what Athens meant to the Greeks. It was the ancient capital of the nation and the fulcrum of its religion. It was a holy place and destined to be the origin of the messiah, who would regenerate the Jewish nation.

The holy Trinity of the apostolic faith was a result of speculation. If there was a Logos, who was the Son of God, his mother would have to be a virgin, since God was his Father. This led to the adoration of immaculate i.e. pure virginity. But the mother was not included in the original Trinity. Her place was occupied by the Holy Ghost symbolized by a dove. But the dove was also the symbol of fertility and the bird of Aphrodite. Thus the dove may be a hidden transformed Virgin who was not expressed so that the personae of the Trinity might have cryptically referred by the dove to the Mother of God. As the personage of the biological Trinity she emerged triumphantly in Byzantion and later on in Western Catholic Christianity as well as in the East as *Magna Mater Styriae*, *Magna Mater Austriae* and as *Regina Poloniae*, where the Mother of God and the Christ-Child were originally worshipped. There were other trinities, the Trinity of the crucified God plus two so-called criminals. A vulgarization of the eucharist is the medieval accusation of the Jews of the ritual murder — as I have mentioned.

That the Xristos was a king of the Jews could only be a bitter mockery and no Pilatus could take such an accusation seriously. Such things are good for a novel, but not for a court of law. The Romans were not interested in Jewish internecine theological squabbles and real rebellion was the only reason, why they

would intervene, not in an absurd Jewish party strife on the nature of deity etc.

The last words of the Xristos on the cross may be psychologically correct, if used in a non-Jewish novel, but they are not appropriate, if they are supposed to be used by a Jewish believer. A Jewish rabbi should have used in extremis the invocation: Sh'ma Yisrael, JHVH elohenu, JHVH echad. In some sense Jewish messianism is a counterpart to the myth of a golden age in the past "Aurea prima sata est aetas" (Ovid). The Judean prophetic imagination places this age of peace and immortality — perhaps after the Persian model — in an indefinite future. But the Christian messianism — which is a pleonasm — lacks all ethnic Judean characteristics, it lacks all transformation of Jewish life, it lacks any opposition to Roman oppression, nay, it praises the Roman state. Such purely metaphysical form of messianism is unthinkable in Judea and such a messiah is equally unthinkable there. Italy, not Palestine or Syria, have a tradition of persecution of Christians, Rome has the catacombs of Jews and Christians, relating to their forms of prayer, burial and their forms of resurrection, and the main allegedly Judean apostle Simon, the son of Jonah or Johanan, has a name changed into Petros, meaning the Rocky one, so that it could be said, "on that rock I shall edify my church", which has no sense, because originally the saints never wanted to build any new church, but assumed that they represent the true Israel. The tradition of Catholicism on one hand, the doctrinal content of the apostolic faith on the other, place its origin in the West and not in the East, in Alexandria and Rome and not in Jerusalem. This is confirmed by archeology, by history and by the very meaning of Christian messianism. Tradition knows really two main apostles, Peter and Paul, but it does not opposes them as do the "Acts", but links them together. It sets them in Rome.

The people living in the Caesarian epoch of an allmighty Roman state could assume that this was the end of the old time, the end of the world and the beginning of something unusual and new, so that it favored such ideas as the allegedly prophesied messianism with its eternal blessing and even eternal life. This could be the mood of Hellenistic Rome, but not of oppressed Judea. If you are bent in discovering the signs of the new age or

of finding a messiah who will aid you to realize your dreams, you may find him and exclaim “Logos sarx egeneto”. Such a messiah will not impose on the Western world ancient customs of the Jewish people, such as circumcision, which have no connection with the new ideals. And as there were allegedly twelve tribes of Israel, the messiah will have 12 messengers or apostles and although all of them would be Jews, only one would be characterized as such, namely the traitor Judas. This in itself is a proof that no Jew is the author of this story. The messiah must legitimize himself by miracles, surpassing those of the former patriarchs and prophets and this was the resuscitation of a dead body. To redeem mankind, the messiah must die, he dies like an innocent lamb at the Passah festival, but he dies on the cross, since this is the rule of Rome. In dying, he invokes God by a psalm instead of the usual Jewish invocation of God. Being the Son of God, the messiah is not a real Jew. The incarnate Logos has no such nationality. The Xristos monogram, the X (khi) transfixes by a P (rho) suggests pictorially crucifixion, but also the Hellenistic origin of the story of crucifixion. Whether the Greek word “fish” – Ichthys – the letters of which add the initials of the words that summarize Christianity (Iesous Xristos Theou Hyios Soter) i.e. Jesus Christ, Son of God (Redeemer) was really the first symbol of the faith, it is impossible to decide. But it is possible that this word was the reason, why initially the fish became the symbol of Christianity, it summarized the essence of the faith but in the Greek language, not in the Aramean and not in Hebrew. This also would show, from where the faith came. From a Greek speaking country.

The Trinity

The Trinity doctrine is a transfer of the Philonian Trinity (World - Logos - God) into the apostolic faith. The Logos doctrine is incorporated into the introduction of the gospel of St. John. He also uses the expression “Lamb” for the messiah and speaks of the “pneuma hagion” (the Holy Ghost) as the dove descending from heaven. In his text this is merely a simile which was later on petrified into a symbol. Symbols are a sort of metaphors

taken literally. St. John is full of speeches attributed to the Xristos, but these are really doctrinal statements in the form of speeches or parables.

The natural form of trinity are two parents and their child. All the trinities are modelled on this one. The Christian Trinity shows by its construction its philosophical origin from the Philonian philosophy, which comprised the World, God and the Logos, his Son, called the Son of God. The Christian Trinity retains the Father and the Son, but eliminates "the world" or a biological mother and replaces them by the Holy Ghost i.e. the "pneuma hagon" the holy breath which is a literal translation of the Hebrew "ruach hakodesh". The latter was also called "shekhina" in Jewish mysticism and means Dwelling, because He dwells with predilection at the Temple of Jerusalem. The components of the Christian Trinity were fictitious as all the three make really One. This One or in Greek Hen was the First and Last Substance of Neoplatonism. The Hellenistic idea that the Xristos or messiah is an "epiphanes" means that the spirit of deity "epiphainetai" or appears in the messiah. It is of course logical that if a person's father is God, he has no earthly father and his Mother remains *via facti* a virgin. This may be a praise in the Roman sense, in the Jewish one the virginity is a deprivation and a curse, the role of the virgin mother and her glorification is a further proof of the non-Jewish origin of the whole Jesus story. The origin of this whole concept is in the philosopher Philon and not in Judea. If anybody, he is the real founder of Christianity.

Neither the Western and still less the Eastern and Northern Europeans could understand the construction of the Hellenistic Trinity nor the lack of the Divine Mother within it. Therefore they had to endow her separately with divine glory as a female deity and this is and was since antiquity a part of the idea of deity. The female deity had therefore to be added to the Christian pantheon, since it corresponds to an emotional need of human beings. If the phases of Christianity are investigated, the poems referring to it, the icons that depict it, the sculptures that evince it, the dedication of the churches, should all be taken into consideration just as the archeological relics. It will then be shown that in the first Hellenistic phase, not the martyrdom of Christ

on the cross was in the center of faith, but his triumphal resurrection and rule of the world as pantocrator. That this obviously changed, when the crucified God became the center of imagination as it happened after the conquests of Islam. The adoration of the Mother of God and Divine Virgin also must have originated in Byzantium, otherwise the multiplicity of icons of the Mother of God would be incomprehensible. The most ancient Polish Christian song is not addressed to Jesus, but to the Mother of God, it is therefore rather a Maternity religion. The martyrdom became the center of the Xristos worship long after all such forms of crucifixion were not in use and became a literary reminiscence. When it was still practiced, it was not religiously depicted. During the Renaissance the cult of the Virgin became a maternity worship, but the Last Judgment of Michelangelo shows a Christ alien to tradition, rather a punishing giant than a crucified messiah. If the main accent of the faith lies not on the messiah, but on his Mother, the Mother of God, such concept may have also arisen in the Byzantine East and spread north- and westward. It is to be assumed that in the original Christianity which did not depict the cross of Jesus, the main accent of the faith lay not on martyrdom and death, but on the triumph over death and resurrection. As in Israel where such prophets as Daniel and Jonah overcome death, the Hellenistic Xristos triumphed of death in resurrection. The worship of the Mother and her child is absent in the Hellenistic phase of Christianity. The Xristos enters eternal life and therefore not the suffering on the cross is the main theme of Hellenistic Christianity. The worship of the Mother of God might have occurred especially in the neighborhood of Ephesus and the Temple of Artemis, the Mother of the Earth. When in Europe the Mother of God and the Christ child became the center of worship, this became a different faith compared with the Hellenistic one. Here the "topos" of motherly love or filial devotion play no role, they are alien to the Hellenistic Logos philosophy and the concern for eternal life. In the Middle Ages the deity becomes the prototype of family relationship, while the main concern of the Hellenistic Christian faith is philosophical and anthropological. In modern Europe, North and West and in the Middle Ages the relationship of Mother and

child, Maternity itself and Martyrdom on the cross become the central concerns of the faith. Martyrdom is divine as St. Francis shows. God is here the greatest Martyr. The greatness of divinity is measured by the greatness of suffering. This social and human ideal of suffering is understandable in the Middle Ages, where insecurity was general and death a daily occurrence. The crucifix became in the Middle Ages a symbol of Christianity in the same way as the “mezuzah”, posted on the entrance door, marked the Jewish habitation. Like the temple of Artemis in Ephesus, the places, where the Virgin Mother was and is revered (Fatima, Częstochowa, Lourdes), are places of pilgrimages and miraculous healings. The Artemis –Syrian and Palestinian Ashtara, Babylonian Ishtar – were transformed in the Jewish literature from a mythological into a patriotic story of Esther. In a similar way the messiah Jesus is killed materially by crucifixion i.e. by a material power, best known. He had to be killed in some way i.e. perform the act of self-immolation to redeem mankind.

The death trial of the Xristos

There is no Roman law on the basis of which the Xristos could be condemned to death and there was no Jewish law on the basis of which he could be punished with crucifixion. If the Jews – what Jews? – wanted to get rid of him, they needed no intervention of a Roman procurator. There was no lack of hired murderers. If he were a rebel and a king of the Jews, that might attract the attention of the Roman authorities, but these accusations are completely meaningless, he created no uprising, he had no royal court, he was an obscure preacher, of whom the Jews could get rid easily. But the remark of John 11,48 that “then the Romans would come and take away our realm if he continued to preach” is completely incomprehensible, because the Romans were already there and have taken away the realm long ago. But the remarks of this kind might reflect the fact that in Rome or Alexandria the “saints” were accused of being rebels. It is also doubtful how and to whom the “archpriest” had made such a remark, this was not his function and he did not speak to the “people”. And what sense has his statement

that Jesus should be killed, because "this will save us and bring the children of God here". What do these "prophecies" mean? A suspicion that the Xristos or his disciples are rebels is expressed in the question addressed to him, whether one should pay taxes to the Caesar. But he answered that in the affirmative. It is of course possible that the loyalty of Christians in Rome was questioned.

That the Jews delivered a dissident Jew to the hated pagan Romans for a transgression of a religious law, completely alien to the Romans, is a historical impossibility. The speeches of the messiah to the king, the procurator, the archpriest, were naturally never held, they are merely a known ancient technique to present ideas or events in a dramatic form. When were any Jewish rabbis or theologians delivered to the Romans for theological concerns? The Qumran community was also opposed to the establishment in Jerusalem, was it handed over to the Romans? It certainly fled the Romans. The writers of the New Testament want to convince the non-Jews that the Jews who persecuted their prophets, also persecuted the Xristos. Therefore they make out of him a sort of half-Jew, not a Judean, but a Galilean. But he is still born in Judea in the place of origin of King David, being his descendant and an anointed one. The most imaginative of story tellers, Lucas, knows that the "Holy Writ" prophesied that Jesus will be crucified and resurrected in three days. The Old Testament knows nothing about it. But Lucas knows (24,15-32) that Jesus himself appeared to his disciples and a certain Cleopas tells him (24,18) what happened to him after death. They recognize Jesus in 24,31. According to Lucas his personages and also Jesus "explain" the holy writings of the Jews to the Jews. There is, however, a contradiction between what is said about the resurrection in the gospel and in the "Acts of the Apostles" also attributed to Lucas. In the latter Jesus appears to his disciples for forty days which reminds one of the Jewish wanderings in the desert for forty years. The presentation of the quarrel of Peter and Paul in the "Acts" shows that Lucas or the author of the "Acts" rejects the Jewish dietary laws and the circumcision of the Jews which was considered the most sacred and the most substantial requirement of traditional Judaism. But the gospels and still more the "Acts"

are propaganda writings addressed mostly to non-Jews, they were destined to condemn the Jews not only politically but also spiritually as impious, because they rejected the messiah, predicted by the holy writings of the Jews themselves. They were a perverted people. But the alleged predictions were merely interpretations, symbolic interpretations of the Old Testament. But it was natural that the Hellenized Orientals, who constituted the bulk of the Christians, rejected the tribal customs of the Jews which were repugnant to them. So did Lucas and so did the so-called Paulus.

The speech that Stephanus addressed to the Jewish authorities in the "Acts" is an example of fictitious speeches. He "explains" to them Jewish history which is superfluous, because they know it anyway and he is stoned to death by those Jews for his "explanation". Paulus is like Jesus delivered to the Romans, but under mitigating circumstances, because he is allegedly a Roman citizen. Still in all the three cases the Jews are the culprits, the wrongdoers, and this is no accident, it is purposeful, and the question is justified: Who persecuted the Christians, the Jews or the Romans? Who was able to persecute them and where were they persecuted? All this shows that the messianic story of the New Testament is the work of Hellenized Orientals, the hereditary enemies of the Jews in an ethnical sense. The story of a trial and of the killing of Jesus are all part of one novel. They are not more real than the story of virgin birth, miraculous multiplication of breads or of wine, or the resuscitation of Lazarus. There are no gradations of reality in the New Testament and no part of the story can be selected as genuine, while others are rejected as mythical. The messiah himself was a miracle. His birth is just as miraculous as his life, insofar it is reported in these writings. Their aim is not historical, but propagandistic and religious. If these events did not occur, they should have occurred in just that way. It is certain that some Jews and some pagans expected the advent of a messiah and this was the reason why he came. In the epoch of the Emperor Tiberius the Xristos could not disappear simply as did Moses or Elijah, but was killed by the Romans at the instigation of the Jews; the Jewish religious authorities become the alleged allies of the Romans. This alliance is a historical absurdity. Here the realistic death is

superimposed to a fictitious, unrealistic life. The sayings of Jesus like his last words are either quotations or utterances of his followers put into his mouth for greater effectiveness. If it is question of a real, not an imaginary death it is very doubtful that a dying man makes quotations, especially when there exists an invocation "in articulo mortis" used by Jews in general. It should be remembered that the writers of the New Testament are writing in the stormiest and most disastrous epoch of Jewish history which ended with the destruction of their land, their Temple and in fact of their religion. The result of this fact is that whatever those writers say about events in Palestine and Jerusalem could never be checked and they take advantage of that fact, they are able to accuse the destroyed Palestinian Jews of anything without fear of retort, but they had to pay heed to the Romans because it would be unwise to attack or to offend them.

If Christianity is a conjunction of epiphany and messianism, originated in a reading of Philon, messianism is here a justification of epiphany, i.e. biblical messianism is supposed to be the legitimation of a pagan belief in epiphany. But this construction could make no sense for Palestinian Jews; to them it would be a strange Hellenistic deviation, because such concepts would be alien to their intellectual life and interests. Such concepts could have been evolved only in the Jewish diaspora such as for instance Alexandria, where Jewish beliefs were under strong impact of Hellenistic speculation. Those Jews spoke Greek and were estranged from their ancient homeland and its interests. A relative of Philon for instance was a Roman general and took part in the Roman-Jewish war on the Roman side. Messianism in its original Jewish form is an eschatological belief in the ultimate resurrection of the Jewish people and its holy city from wars and oppression. As such it had no meaning at all for the pagan world despite its poetical description of the cosmic world peace etc. It acquired such meaning only by a symbolic interpretation and unification with epiphany. It then acquired in the eyes of the non-Jews more credibility and satisfactoriness, but lost them for the Palestinian Jews. Yet the drama of the messiah had to be played out in Palestine, this was its natural stage. It should therefore be placed there. The stories

about the death of the messiah might have been written after the first destruction of Jerusalem or shortly before it, but then remade in a way that the destruction seemed a punishment for the alleged rejection of the messiah by the Jewish Palestine and his alleged crucifixion. But all these things were written outside of Palestine and its inhabitants knew nothing about them. The story of the incarnation of the Logos was certainly unknown to them.

All realistic circumstances concerning the messiah are fictitious. His name, his place of birth are mythical and the latter justified by an alleged massacre of infants which never took place and due to an excess of bloodthirsty imagination. The place whence his family allegedly came, Nazareth, did not exist, the sort of death attributed to him was never practiced by the Jews and they certainly did not ask a Roman whom they considered a malefactor and a pagan, to kill a dissident Jew. What is said about him, is supposed to square with alleged prophecies. Egypt plays a role in his life, because it did so in the life of Moses and perhaps, because the whole concept of the incarnation of the Logos and the epiphany is derived from Philon's philosophy which arose in Alexandria. Pilatus makes out of him derisively a king of the Jews, because if he were such a king without Roman consent and therefore a rebel, this would have been the only reason, why the Romans would be interested in him. Pilatus, however, was intelligent enough to distinguish a rebel from a non-rebel and the Jews must have understood equally all that. As the Jews of Jerusalem did not exist any more and Pilatus committed suicide in exile, it was possible to impute to them improbable things without being refuted. The strongly pro-Roman statements in the New Testament are probably due to the fact that the Christians were by no means liked in Rome and their spiritual leaders wanted to placate the Romans and the anxious members of their community.

Redemption, catharsis, baptism

It seems that the idea of redemption is based on previous catharsis i.e. purification, but this is not a psychological catharsis

by fear and compassion, but by the blood of the messiah. It is a catharsis by the blood of a victim like a sacrifice of an animal in a temple, where the blood of the animal is given to the Deity and purifies the donor. Another form of purification is the purification by washing the sins away with water. This is the unbloody purification practiced by St. John the Baptist. The Jews know until today both forms of purification. The bloody one is that by circumcision which gives a part of a member the most representative of masculinity to the deity by circumcision. This sacrifice – the only one that does not destroy the function of this part of the body – means the entry into the Jewish community or the baptism by blood. Unbloody baptism is still performed with gentile females by water. The Jewish tradition according to which circumcision is a sign of the covenant of Abraham with God is purely mythological, it should rather be supposed that it is a sort of sacrifice of the male to Abraham as Ab-Aram, i.e. the Father or God of Aram. The catharsis in the form of eucharist, i.e. the purification by the blood of a divine factor, namely the Xristos, is not Jewish in that Roman epoch, but Hellenistic. It is of course a higher type of purification. But the Christianity still left the purification by water after the model of John the Baptist as a sort of entrance into the Christian community. Eucharist is of course a higher form of purification than mere baptism, namely symbolic and philosophical. On the other hand having the purification by blood in form of the eucharist, Christianity needed no sacrifice in the form of circumcision, since the sacrifice of the Xristos encompassed every other sacrifice, also circumcision. Christianity was through the eucharist to the so-called Gentiles the billet d'entrée into eternal life. As such it was unique and valuable beyond prize.

Christianity was an adaptation of the Jewish religion in the form of the Septuagint to the needs of the Greco-Roman world without the encumbrances of the Jewish tribal customs and purely national holidays. But only a peripheral fragment of the Jewish religion was incorporated thereby, namely messianism, i.e. redemption and eternal life – its being even doubtful whether this was really originally a Jewish concept. This messianism was transformed into the core

of the new “religion”, if this can be called in that way. The messianic prophecies do not constitute a large part of the Old Testament and large parts of Jewish society may have considered this eschatological vision of eternal bliss as a poetical vision of prophetological writers. This myth which was tangential in Judaism became the core of the myth of Christianity. In its Christian form as entrance into eternal life this messianic myth has nothing within it to make it localized in Palestine, rather should it be localized in a Hellenistic region of the Jewish diaspora among the Hellenized Orientals, the sworn enemies of Jewry. This system of complicated, updated and philosophically grounded neo-Judaism whose representatives tried vainly to remove from it all vestiges of Judaism, but lacked the imagination of doing so, was originated by sects of Jewish ascetics dispersed in the Roman empire, but was really established by the Roman world, 1) through the destruction of Jerusalem, its temple, its people, its religion, 2) through the Greco-Roman-Oriental establishment in Byzantium or Constantinople and its final Hellenization. Its factual background in Palestine was the baptismal activity of John the Baptist, who tried to wash away the sins of the people by the waters of the Jordan, but was killed or perhaps decapitated by the semi-Jewish Idumean Herodes Antipas, whose predecessor Herodes also killed the surviving members of the national Hasmonean dynasty and was decried as tyrant and alien usurper.

The writers of the New Testament attack with obstinacy among the Jewish sects enumerated by Flavius Josephus the Pharisees or Perushim, they accuse them of insincerity, duplicity and similar failings. The question arises: Why they single them out?, because they represented the traditional Judaism and rejected the messianism of Christians. The word “Perushim” or Pharisees means “separationists”, they desired separation of the Jews from the non-Jewish world, something which was opposed by the Christian sectarians, who wanted to convert the world to their beliefs. In modern parlance they were internationalists, while the Pharisees were nationalists. The Pharisees were the believers in God and the Torah and in the oral tradition and were therefore the true followers of the trend that destroyed the Syrian domination in Judea and created the Hasmonean

dynasty. The followers of messianism who were mostly Oriental proselytes, could not support the Jewish integralists, namely the Pharisees and this implacable enmity was only seemingly religious, it was really also ethnic and political. It is for the same reasons that the New Testament writers support the Samaritans and criticized the Jews. The Samaritans did not support the Jewish tradition in the same way as the bulk of Jews, they rejected the oral tradition and were in addition regarded as non-Jews in an ethnic sense and this was reason enough for the followers of messianism who were also ethnic non-Jews and rejected the oral tradition of Jewry to prefer the ethnic Samaritans to the Jews. The so-called epistles of St. Paul are not directed by one person, but by various followers of the apostolic faith to those places, where its followers were most numerous, in Rome, in Asia Minor, in the international port city of Corinth, and in Macedonia. There were probably no Christians in ethnic Greece which was owing to depopulation a region of economic depression.

It is unclear to which Christians the "Letter to the Hebrews" was directed. Its text shows the close relationship to the Alexandrian literature for instance the Gospel of St. John. He states namely that lastly God spoke to us through his son whom he made heir of all things and through whom he has created eternity (scilicet: the world). This is clearly the Philonian Logos concept. In addition he makes out of the Xristos a high priest after the order of Melchisedek, not merely of Levi. He clearly states that his sacrifice of his own blood made all other sacrifices obsolete and that he washed thereby away the sins of mankind. This is a clear reason, why the eucharist abolishes the Jewish sacrifices in the Temple of Jerusalem. The order of Melchisedek is naturally higher than that of Levi to whom the high priests of the Temple belonged. And while he knows the self-sacrifice of the messiah, he does know the crucifixion, but he mentions it only once so that this may be an interpolation. Christianity originated not in provincial Palestine, but in the metropolitan centers of the Roman empire such as Alexandria or Rome. Therefore the treatment of failing women or of women in general is un-Jewish, it does not correspond to the patriarchal family treatment of women-folk of the

traditional Jewry, but rather the sophisticated treatment of the female as it developed in the metropolitan centers of the Greco-Roman world. It was more "liberal" and more "progressive" in modern parlance. This is also due to the fact that the Christian stress lay not on intellectual standing, but on character. Furthermore, it is possible that many women flocked to the announcers of a new age, of liberation of mankind. The favoring of the messianic faith by women is reflected in the gospels by the position of the messiah toward women.

The Quarrel about the Faith

The main ideological content of the New Testament, especially of the gospels and "The Acts of the Apostles" is the quarrel with the Jews about the faith. But about which faith do the spokesmen of the faith of the saints quarrel with the Jews? About any new religion? Obviously not. They quarrel about the Jewish faith. They assume that they represent the true and genuine form of the Jewish faith, adjusted to the last events, namely to the appearance of the Logos or Son of God and his incarnation in the messiah as according to their opinion was predicted by the Old Testament, namely the Jewish prophets. They did not intend to create any new religion. Thus if even Philon himself would have suggested the identification of the Son of God with the biblical messiah — which was certainly possible — he would have never assumed that he has founded thereby a new religion different from Judaism. He never intended that. Nor did his followers intend it. It is true, however, that the Palestinian Jews did not share his assumptions or his form of interpretation of the Old Testament. The Pharisees who are so often an object of criticism by the spokesmen of the Messianic convictions certainly understood the Old Testament in a different way. They did not comment it like Philon and for the most part knew nothing about it. For them the incarnation of the Logos represented no religious concept of Judaism. This was an upshot of Hellenistic imagination. But there must have been a moment, when the separation of Judaism and the messianic faith was accomplished. This was — whether its

votaries knew it or not — in the moment, when they believed in messianism and practiced the eucharist after the destruction of the Temple in Jerusalem, so that the body of the messiah replaced it as an object of religious worship. This was the definitive detachment from the geographically defined abode of the Deity in the Temple in Jerusalem. When still in Babylonian captivity, the Jews wanted in the first place to restore this temple, because this was the predilected dwelling of God and without it there was no real Judaism. The Divinity was geographically localized. Now when the Temple was destroyed for the second time by the Romans and the body of the Xristos replaced it as the instrument of holiness and divinity, the geographical link was severed, the ideological temple became invisible and the magic action of the eucharist took over the work of purification and redemption. The link with traditional Judaism was thereby severed, because it ceased to exist with the destruction of the Temple. Now the so-called rabbinic Judaism was subject to the same strictures, but it was reduced to the hope of a future messianic restoration. When a new Jewish uprising broke out fifty years later, Hadrian crushed it and forbade circumcision. But this is difficult to enforce, and was probably abolished by Antoninus Pius. But it shows wherein Judaism consisted in the eyes of the world and also that those spokesmen of the “saints” who opposed circumcision, wanted ipso facto to remove all relations with traditional Judaism and tried to justify it by metaphysical reasons. The sacrifice of the Xristos made the mutilation of the newborn male infant superfluous. The eucharist must have been instituted after the destruction of the Temple in Jerusalem. Until then animals were sacrificed there and their blood was a gift to the deity. Furthermore the shewbreads which lay inside the Temple, were inspected from time to time by the high priest and by him alone. He had obviously to control, whether the Deity has accepted those shewbreads as gifts. The eucharist replaced these gifts and sacrifices and there was a magical element in it, insofar as only the eucharist procured to the faithful the blessings of the faith, namely the entry into eternal life. In rabbinical Judaism the solemn readings of the Torah with a certain intonation and “scansio” had to replace the temple worship,

while the blessings expressed by the priests (kohanim) in a certain posture and holding of hands added probably some magical element to the service.

The quarrel of the Christians with the Jews was despite its acerbity a family quarrel, it was a quarrel about the right interpretation of the Judaism at the present time, but it was complicated by the fact, that the discussants were ethnically different and therefore also politically at odds. The Christians were not persecuted by the Jews, there was no possibility of such persecution. They were rather persecuted by the Romans and had to take great care, not to increase their difficulties politically. For some three hundred years Palestine and Jerusalem were never any object of Christian interest and this is such a long stretch of time, that conditions became completely different in the Roman Empire, even its capital was transferred to a Greek colony close to the Black Sea, to Byzantion, from now on called Constantinoupolis. Only Constantine's mother Flavia Julia Helena became now interested on the basis of what was read or told her, about Jerusalem and she made a pilgrimage there, when old Jerusalem did not exist, when crucifixions were not practiced, when Greek became the main language of the so-called Roman empire and Helena herself was a Hellenized Oriental from Nicomedia in Asia. The connection of this epoch with the epoch of the ruling "gens Julia-Claudia" in Rome was very tenuous and there was scarcely any institutional continuity in the religious sense between the two epochs, it was rather a literary continuity.

The Christian spokesmen congregated in the time of Constantine in Nicaea, because there in Asia Minor the Greek speaking Christians were most numerous. But there was under the threshold of consciousness always a conviction that Rome was the holy city of Christianity, that this was the abode and grave of Peter and Paul, the two apostles, that the Xristos called on them there, that there were the graves of those apostles and of the first saints and martyrs in the catacombs. The conviction that Jerusalem was a sacred place may have — not theoretically — but practically arisen before, during and after the Crusades, but that happened four times three hundred years after the beginnings of Christianity, i.e. after 40 generations and then the

connection with the origins of Christianity was certainly less institutional, but more literary.

Despite the fact, that the law which established Christianity as a state religion, was passed in Byzantion, that it was by a fiat issued in Byzantion that Christianity was declared the only legal faith in the Roman Empire, Constantinople was never held to be a holy city of Christianity, although it was the greatest and the most powerful Christian city. And it was certainly there that the Crucified God was made the standing symbol of Christianity after the victories of Islam and the loss of Asia for the apostolic faith, the loss of the Christian Oriental provinces, the true cradle of Christianity in the East.

The phases of Christianity

One fact blurred forever the beginning of this faith: that it arose not only in the most tragic and destructive epoch of Palestine Jewry and Jewry in general, but also in a very tragic epoch of Roman history, namely the destruction of the „gens Julia-Claudia” and the initiation of the regimes backed by the imperial guard and the military. Another equivocal point was that being a form of neo-Judaism it had no clear conscious beginning by a leading personality and furthermore that being in part linked to Greek philosophy, it never cut clearly the connection with Neoplatonic philosophy nor with messianic Judaism. But its development was first hampered by the internal conditions of the Roman Empire and later on by the incursions of the Barbarians from the forests in the North, the steppes in the East and the deserts in the South. In the 300 years that elapsed between the institution of the Christianity in the East and its overthrow by the Islamic invasions, it had the epoch of magnificence under the Emperor Justinian, but in the West, Roman Catholicism had to wait for its great time until the year 800 under Charlemagne and at that time the splendor of the Christian Byzantine East was gone in Asia and the Arabs were already in Spain. It won however the Balkan Slav world and soon thereafter Russia for itself.

The messianic religion is certainly the most successful deno-

mination that prevailed in the declining Roman empire and it is very difficult to understand its success, if it is regarded as one of Oriental cults that were introduced in Rome itself or elsewhere in the Roman state. But if we assume, that it was prepared in Alexandria and formed in Rome, it was not one of the Oriental cults, introduced in Rome. If it had been imported from Palestine, it would have been one of the Oriental cults, but it wasn't. It was rather a Hellenistic conception and even its Hebrew basis was derived not from some Oriental literature, but from the Septuagint, i.e. the Greek translation of the Old Testament. It was not introduced by foreign priests as were other Oriental cults, it was evolved by the Hellenistic thinkers. It was so to speak a homegrown creed. And it was formed according to the spiritual needs of the Hellenistic population. This superiority of the messianic religion is unquestionable. Only this creed prompted a whole patristic literature of the same Hellenistic population, no Oriental cult did it. It obviously interested the Hellenistic population much more than any other religious concepts imported from the Orient. This one was in fact not imported. And it had another great advantage: the authority of God himself and his prophets as authors of the religious literature. Moses was not regarded as the personal author of what he said. He received it from God himself. These were God's words. The New Testament had behind it the authority of the Xristos, the Son of God. The Oriental cults could not compete with these authorities. You may have doubted the existence of Isis or Serapis, you could not shake the authority of God himself. This God had no name, it was God, „tout court". And this was also analogous, insofar the Xristos or Son of God was concerned. It was *the* Xristos. Only if all these details are taken into consideration, can the fortunes of the faith of the saints be understood.

Another problem of this faith is its very long duration. Here it should be noticed, that it was basically transmitted to and accepted by those nations or ethnic groups that had together with it or before or after it also accepted the Hellenistic civilization. And just these nations were the most successful in human history, perhaps because they accepted this civilization. The specific character of this civilization is the scientific research of

the truth about the world. Although the method of knowing favored by the messianic religion was the unquestioned acceptance of the revealed truth as is shown by the characterization of such personages as the apostle Thomas, yet the apostolic faith never repudiated its link with the Hellenistic philosophy and especially with Neoplatonism. It could be even called itself a phase of Hellenistic philosophy, while the phase known as that of Plotinus is a prolongation of the Christian philosophy with the elimination of the name of God and its replacement by the neutral "The One" which is still a deity, whereas the emanations from it correspond to the Old Testamentarian creations out of nothing. Christian philosophers and especially mystics returned in general to Neoplatonic concepts and so did all idealistic philosophies, included that of Hegel. All these philosophies seek the truth about the world not outside, but inside the human mind. The nations that accepted the Hellenistic civilization and Christianity are in general ethnically or linguistically related. But the duration is less impressive, if you analyze its vicisitudes and internal mutations. An iconoclastic Christianity is very much different from the Orthodox or Roman varieties and yet, there is no doubt, that the original Christians considered spiritual, not sensual life as the real and right one and iconoclastic tendencies existed not only in Constantinople, they were revived by Savonarola and prevailed in Protestantism. They are basically ascetic. And ascesis is indigenous to the faith of the saints.

Any single phases of Christianity scarcely lasted longer than 300 years, although if stripped to purely monotheistic meanings it may have an indefinite duration.

The Roman origins of Christianity

Hardly anybody has thought of making Christianity a phase of Hellenistic philosophy and placing it for that reason in a history of philosophy. And hardly anybody thought about the fact that the apostles of the messianic faith are made fishermen at the Lake Tiberias. But this is one of the proofs of the Roman origin of the New Testament story. Tiberias was called so to honor the

Emperor Tiberius, it reminded one of the river Tiber. It was called Tiberias just at the time, when the messianic faith became “modern” and it was the name of a town and of the lake Kinnereth or Genezareth whose name is composed in Greek pronunciation of two words, namely Ge-Nezareth – the region Nazareth. Therefore the non-existing city of Nazareth was called the place of origin of the messiah in addition to the fact that a “nassir” was a pious, holy man like John the Baptist. It should be added that the latter was not killed by Herodes the Great who was supposed to arrange the massacre of innocents, but by Herodes Antipas, his successor. The so-called massacre would have taken place in the last year of the reign of Herodes the Great, when he was already 70 years old. But it was him who had named the city on the Lake Kinnereth in honor of the reigning monarch Tiberias. The reason why the apostles were called fishermen on the Lake Tiberias was the fact that those people who evolved this story were just from Rome. Hence their associations with those names. The cemeteries of Rome called catacombs as the first burying (and also praying) places of the Christians point naturally to the same direction. The origin of Christianity was Rome, the metropolis of the world and not provincial Jerusalem, but it was of course more Romantic and it conformed more to religious “prophecies” to remove the origins of the messianic faith from the hustle and bustle of Rome and set them in far-off Palestine on the borders of a lake, now dedicated to the famous and terrible monarch.

It is remarkable that the Jews of the Catholic European East, their genuine homeland, hold the Catholic religion (even in the last century) rather as a form of paganism, in view of its colorful processions with painted banners, icons, with incense etc. They do not seem to realize that incense was used in their own holy temple. That they consider all this as a form of paganism is evident from two expressions: “tyme” and “tule”. The former (“tyme”) is related to “domus”, German “Dom”, Polish “tüm”, meaning cathedral. Yet the Yiddish word has a pejorative connotation meaning a temple full of “tule’s” which means “idols” and is obviously related to the Greek “eidolon” picture, idol. Such a “tule” is obviously what the Germans call “Götze”, an image of an unreal god. “Tule’s” are carried in

processions, they are the pictures of saints and sacred persons. The basic icon, the icon of all icons is the representation of the Crucified, but crowned slave of Rome, who became in the 8th century after the victories of Islam in the East, the incarnate God of the Christians. They now divinized not his resurrection from the dead, but his superhuman suffering. This was the new post-Hellenic Christianity. Suffering as measure of divinity.

What was accepted in Rome and Alexandria was a pseudo-Judaism in the shape of salvational epiphany which had the form of a semi-god with a human face who promised the world eternal life ("I am the Life"). But this was not the meaning of Jewish messianism and this was no redemption which the Jews needed, being already in the hands of God the Almighty. Only the pagans needed this form of redemption. Since the Jews of Palestine did not practice the symbolic interpretation of the Pentateuch like Philon, they did not interpret the failing of Adam as an original sin. This redemption was due only, if the Pentateuch was symbolically interpreted. The name of the Babylonian King Merodach-Baladan can only mean "Baal of Eden", i.e. the god of paradise or perhaps even Baal-Adam, the God Adam. Thus the formula used for "Ben Adam" by the prophet Hesekiel and also for the Christian Messiah does not mean originally the Son of man, because this has little sense, but the son of the god Adam, he is obviously the God of the Earth and his wife is "Havah", the "Living one". This may be a couple of terrestrial deities like Pluto and Artemis, as I mentioned.

St. Luke is the most imaginative of the New Testament writers and he may himself be of the descent which he attributes to Paul and his ideas about the Greeks and Jews are similar to those of Flavius Josephus. In addition he shows in his prefaces to Theophilus clearly, as I have said, that he is not going to report facts, but to tell a story, even miraculous stories. He may be at home in the region of Ephesus or Tarsos, since his knowledge of Ephesus is most detailed, and while neither Tarsos nor Ephesus were Jewish centers, Ephesus was one of the main centers of early Christianity. And the Temple of Artemis must have inspired the worship of the Mother of God which became one of the main features of medieval Christianity. These

breeding-places show also the places of origin. Poetry and rhetoric, literary knowledge were the basis of Hellenistic education, and knowledge of God and his commandments were the basis of Jewish post-exile education. The Hellenistically educated pagans needed the Logos philosophy, the complicated trinitarian doctrine as basis of their religion. But these philosophically underpinned doctrines which became a philosophy of deity or theology, were entirely alien to Jewish thinking and could not arise in Palestine. The writers of the gospels transformed a theory of redemption into a realistic story of a trial and a worldly condemnation to death of what was originally an idea of self-immolation. This realistic story was directed against the Jews. The original phase of Christianity as it still appears in the "Letter to the Romans" is by no means directed against the Jews, but against paganism and its sexual excesses. The Christian messiah had to die to show that resurrection was possible on earth and thus to accomplish his mission on earth. In Jewish lore the eternity of God encompassed all human beings, therefore individual immortality was not necessary. It was certainly imported to Israel from non-Jewish sources and is mentioned in Daniel in the form of resurrection of the body. It was a bone of contention between the Sadducees and Pharisaic bulk of the Jews, who accepted and incorporated in their creed the idea of individual immortality.

Although the eucharist is perhaps a modified meal after death usual in Israel (*dapes post mortem*) it was transmuted into a rite which guaranteed eternal life, promised by the Xristos, it is also prefigured in the blood sacrifices and shewbreads of the Temple. When the latter was destroyed, the Holy Ghost (*pneuma hagion*) departed from it and from Israel, therefore the Jewish religion became truncated and frustrated, a mere torso, therefore the eternal lamentations at the Western (Wailing) Wall and elsewhere. It is then that the Christianity could take over and fill the gap in such a way that the body of the Xristos replaced the Temple. But he did it for the non-Jews, not for the Jews, and the non-Jews lacked ethnically and religiously this relationship with the Temple of Jerusalem. To the Christians it was an allegory, a symbolic thing. Jewish messianism was different, it had to restore the glory of Israel and establish eternal peace, because

Israel was a little nation surrounded by warlike greater nations, it could prosper only in a universe of peace. Christian messianism meant eternal life for the single individual accessible to all "saints", while at present the non-religious lay messianism consists in the universal equality of goods accessible to everybody. It is clear that the Christians as mostly Hellenized Orientals and non-Jews could not be interested in the Jewish form of messianism just as the Jews must have regarded Christian messianism as a new attempt to ethnic annihilation and not to redemption. The Jewish messiah had not necessarily to die as had the Christian messiah, because they had to accomplish different missions and the Jewish messiah was undetermined, it might have been the expected prophet Elijah, even such a king like Cyrus who is also called the Anointed one or it could be the whole people of Israel.

The Jewish religious literature of the Old Testament is worked over by the leaders of Judaism and mythology is therefore often changed into history, its deciphering is much more difficult than that of the New Testament which also consists not of finished works but of fragments. The most completed ones in a literary sense are the two writings of St. Luke's, but also less valuable, because Luke wants to achieve in his presentation literary perfection, he modifies his presentation to realize this aim which is not historical correctness, but literary excellence. His life story of Paul is a more orderly rehash of the stories of Bileam, St. John the Baptist and even Jesus himself and it centers like that of Jesus equally on a trial, this time by a Jewish king and even allegedly by the far-off Caesar. But what had this Caesar to judge? Nothing. The circumstance that the writers of the New Testament place the scene of the events they describe in Palestine, is the only reason that the Orient or Judea or Galilea enter into the picture of those events. Yet, they had to place them there for literary reasons, they are conformed to prophecies of the Old Testament, if they were put elsewhere. But all this is written in Greek and is addressed to Greek speaking people, not to the people of Palestine. They preserve some Hebrew words, petrified by use anywhere in the Diaspora of the Jews such as "osanna", "alleluia", "raboni". But this literature could have arisen only

in the Jewish Diaspora, not in Palestine. If the activities of Jesus are set in Palestine, this is no reason to hold them for historical facts. If the Xristos was a religious figure created by religious imagination, then his eternal absence was best explained by the fact that he was killed, because this was the best possible explanation of his eternal absence. The killing is an explanation of his permanent absence from life, not of his fate. Christianity or messianic neo-Judaism is a heritage of Hellenistic antiquity and these philosophical remnants of the Hellenistic epoch married to the ethics of Jewish asceticism made it the appropriate vehicle of progressive world civilization. Its documents are written in Greek and are addressed to the Greek speaking strata of the Roman empire, they arose in Rome itself or in another metropolitan Hellenistic center, not in any provincial center of the East such as Judea or Galilee. And even Tarsos was a Hellenistic metropolis. There are three incontrovertible truths: the pagan nations of antiquity evolved and clung to the Nicean faith of orthodox Christianity most rigidly. The archeological remnants of this faith are in Rome. There are none in Jerusalem before the fourth century of our era, because there were no Christians and no Christian community there nor any element belonging to them before that time. Palestine Jewry could not and did not produce any Christian messiah. The Logos incarnate in a living man was not a product of the Palestinian soil. Christianity is a fruit of the Jewish Diaspora and of the Gentile converts to it.

The attempt of historization of Christianity by the use of the figure of Paul cannot succeed, because the thirteenth apostle is just as mythical as the Saviour. His trips are as fictional as those of Robinson Crusoe. Both the Xristos and his main propagandist are literary creations and the new faith is a collective work of many unknown hands. The reason why no relics of the earliest period of Christianity are found in Judea, nor in its rocky soil is that there were no such beginnings there. The gospels of Christianity are versions of a novel that has become a religion. Messianism won over the Greco-Roman world, because it was its work and a spiritual need of this world and the Logos found then its incarnation, because the latter was desired. The approach of the Jews and of the Hellenistic population to the

world was entirely different. The Jews were convinced, that they were the unique holders of the absolute truth about God and the world, the Greeks and Romans had no such conviction. The Jews were so to speak children of God. What they needed, was not therefore any redemption, but obedience to the Lord. This was their salvation, tout court, and this was said by their prophets. When the Gentiles were converted to the messianic religion, they took over such a conviction and they became the possessors of the absolute truth. Thereby arose two irreconcilable absolute truths. This inner conviction that they were in the hands of God-rendered possible the survival of Jewry – no matter what happened to them – because they had the unshakable self-assurance of the righteousness of their cause and of the correctness of their beliefs, during all persecutions of the outside world.

The Christian martyrs were animated by the same belief. But the non-Jewish nations considered in antiquity such Jewish beliefs as absurd, supercilious and insupportable and therefore the great hatred of the Jews among the Hellenistic Orientals. The Romans were in a different position as rulers of the world.

Nobody prevented Pilatus after he returned to Rome to retell the strange story of the crucified prophet and the accompanying riot of the Jewish multitude, but he never said a word about it and he did not obey or help the Jews in any way. On the contrary, they hated him and at their behest he was removed from office, went to Gaul and committed suicide. That the Jews asked him to kill a dissident Jew, is a historical absurdity. The Pilatus of the gospels has only the name in common with the historical Pilatus. The literature of the incarnation of the Logos should be therefore scrutinized for its symbolic meaning, not only the names should be investigated, but even the single letters. Thus we see that the name of the Xristos in Hebrew (Ieshuah) has the same two letters at the beginning and the end as the name of God, namely J and H. The writers of the gospels did not know how the Xristos died, they did not witness his death, but they knew that the word Xristos starts with a cross, they put him on the cross of his designation. The monogram of Christianity, a X crossed by P (rho) evolved into the picture of a man [rho extended on a X (cross)] and the picture became

more bloodier the more distant it was from the source until it got crystallized in the form of a crucified god, crowned with thorns. Literature became here reality, not reality literature.

Jewish parties and Greek philosophies

The three parties that Flavius Josephus saw among the Jews correspond to the different philosophic schools of the Hellenistic world, for instance the stoics, the epicureans etc. But the point of dissension was not of the same kind among the Jews as among the partisans of different philosophies. The latter differed in world view and as a result of the ethics of life. Among the Jews the moot point was, whether one considered the oral tradition (the so-called Thora shebalpeh) as important as the written Torah (the thora shebechetab). There were always parties among the Jews that recognized only the written Torah, but not the oral tradition, for instance, the Sadducees, the Samaritans, the Kareans and so forth. The Gentile supporters of messianism supported the symbolic interpretation of the Torah in the Hellenistic way, so they could not support the oral Talmudic tradition as did the bulk of the Jews of Palestine and their intellectual leaders, the Pharisees. Therefore the Pharisees are the natural opponents of the saints and their Hellenistic interpretation. The Hellenistic non-Jews also opposed circumcision and the dietary laws quite naturally. The Hellenistic messiah was a messiah of redemption and the latter presupposes the original sin. Here the prerequisite is the symbolic interpretation of the Genesis. The Hellenistic messiah redeems the sins of all men with his blood and rises from the dead as a proof of his accomplishment. The Jewish messiah was no messiah of redemption, but of liberation of the Jewish people from foreign domination and an achiever of eternal peace. These are two different forms of messianism. The Christian type of messianism whose adepts accepted and even justified or exalted the destruction of Jerusalem and its Temple, could not like the Jewish community of Palestine. Its opponents were not national, but merely individualistic and as such adjusted to the spiritual needs of the Hellenistic pagans, but not to the Jews.

Hellenistic redemption was to the Jews an alien philosophy and its reward, eternal life of the individual, was believed by the Pharisees anyway and only of marginal interest to the Jews. The "Letter to the Romans" shows, that the main concern of the Gentiles, to whom it was directed, was the fear of eternal death and that the Christian redemption was the removal of that fear, while the main interest of Jewish messianism was the happiness of the people of Israel, not of individuals, and eternal peace, but these things were not of prime interest to the Hellenistic Gentiles.

Many writings of the New Testament must be understood as documents of the chronic unceasing war of Hellenism against the Jewish state, the institutional Jewish religion, therefore the Jewish synhedrion is pictured as composed of evil men, the Temple tainted by mercantilism, the religious scholars hypocrites and behind all this even an infamous traitor, Judas. This cannot be an objective picture of the Jewish society, although the latter was certainly also denounced by Jewish ascetics and other critics. The Old Testament abounds in such criticism. But these are criticisms of Jews by Jews and they have another tenor than those of the New Testament, these are denigrations by outsiders. However, all these parties among the Jews had little meaning outside of Palestine in the Diaspora. E.M. Smallwood ("The Jews under Roman Rule", Leiden 1976) thinks that "Judaism enjoyed a position of rare privilege as a protected cult" in the Roman empire as long as it was non-Christian. This opinion was hardly shared by the Jews of Palestine, although it may have coincided with the thoughts of the Jews of Alexandria and Rome. The incompatibility of the ancient Judaic cult and the Christian reform is evident from the fact, that the Jewish Temple and Christian messianism could not or at least did never coexist. Rabbinic Judaism tried to construct a Judaism without a Jewish state just as the Christians formed their worship originally without the aid of the Roman state, but they reaped the fruits of the Roman destruction of the Jewish state, and of the Jewish Temple. The "privileged" position of the Jewish cult did not prevent the Emperor Claudius from expelling the Jews from Rome nor Emperor Hadrian from forbidding circumcision. Both Jews and Greeks were dispersed, but the

Greeks never ventured outside the Eastern part of the Mediterranean Sea including Italy, Sicily and Marseille; the Jews were driven farther north, east and west. The messianic religion became a state cult after 10 generations, but its Trinitarian form was a philosophy of a pagan thinking that assimilated the New Testament documents. Opposition to it was not inexistent, but it did not come from Judaism rendered completely impotent in the Roman Empire, but from Arianism, monophysitism etc. But it is almost as far from Nicaean Trinitarianism to the messianic origins as from Plato to Cicero. Constantine made out of it a state religion and his successors an exclusive one in the Empire. Yet Judaism survives only in the countries where it meets the challenge of Christianity, and it is doubtful, whether it could survive elsewhere.

Judaism and messianism

The messianic story dealt with contemporary events, not with events of a far distant past as most other cults. Judaism has as its center the stories of the mythical patriarchs with whom God made his covenant, especially with Abraham. But the life of the Xristos and God's intervention into human affairs was recent, it happened during the reign of the „gens Julia-Claudia“. What occurred before, was prehistory or prophecy of this crucial event. No creed could really boast of such contemporary divine intervention. The center of messianism was the life and death of the Xristos, the center of Judaism its past. The content of messianism was the redemption of sinful humanity by the life and death of the Xristos; what happened before, led to that life and death. Thus the center of gravity of these two creeds was really quite different, although the stem was common to both. The Xristos reunited in his life and death all that preceded him. The redemption of sinful mankind was his main function. This he accomplished by his death. This belief in redemption was philosophical and unique, because it was not visible by any external marks or properties, yet it existed. This philosophical belief in redemption was a result of Hellenistic philosophical speculation. The fact is that the faithful could pass

from the state of sin into a state of redemption by the belief into the messianic story and some symbolic acts such as baptism or the eucharist. Through this redemption the faithful could win eternal life. And be resurrected as was the Xristos. The aim of this faith was to constitute a sort of paradise on earth. Passah or Easter commemorated this passage from a state of sin to the state of salvation and eternal life. The messianic cult was therefore the most modern cult established during the Roman imperial rule at its beginnings, and expanded everywhere within the confines of this empire. It had therefore the authority of a world state. The idea of redemption is a proof that this kind of messianism was evolved and worked out, not in Palestine, but in the Hellenistic world. The Jews needed no messiah of redemption, they were already redeemed by the covenant of God with Abraham, they needed only obedience to the laws of God. The pagans lived in sin and needed therefore redemption and their sinning was explained by the original sin of Adam and Eve. The idea of redemption is linked only with the pagan, not with the Jewish world. The alleged utterance of the Xristos in the gospel of St. John that his kingdom is not of this world means really that he is not a messiah of the Jews, because their Anointed one was rather supposed to be a real king and liberate his people as did for instance Moses. The answer means, that this anointedness is meant symbolically, not literally, but this is also the answer that he is symbolically a messiah, not within the Jewish meanings of the word. If he had lived and worked among the Jews, it would have been incongruous, because they needed not him, but another messiah. But this shows also that Palestine did not belong logically or historically to this messianism at all and that it was erroneous to mix up Palestine and Jerusalem with this story or that both Palestine and Jerusalem have here merely a symbolic, not a realistic, factual, sense. Just as Passah was changed from a feast of liberation of the Hebrews from Egyptian servitude into a feast of liberation from sin and death, the meaning of the Judean and Galilean place names should be taken symbolically. The Judaism of the messianic complex is not a real, but a symbolic Judaism. But this made it appropriate for the Greco-Roman world. A national Jewish messianism would be meaningless for the Hellenistic world and vice-versa

the Hellenistic messianism was meaningless for the Judean world. To them it was merely another attempt at Hellenization. In fact they did not know this messianic theory born in Alexandria and developed in Rome. And when they got cognizance of it, they rejected it. But the story of its origin was to them certainly a complete mystery.

The pagans believed that there could be different religious truths for different nations, the Egyptians, the Syrians, the Greeks etc. and that they were all valid one alongside the other. The religions could therefore quite naturally and without any opposition coexist. Nobody expected a Greek to worship Syrian deities as a matter of course. The Jews, however, considered all these alien beliefs as pagan superstitions. This was in itself offensive to other nations. In addition the Jews could not accept hospitality of non-Jews for eating together, because they had special dietary laws which marked them out among the nations. This had social and economical consequences. The Jews became therefore so to speak the main troublemakers of the ancient world and invited hatred and opposition. Their reputation among the ancients could not improve, when they alone among the inhabitants of the Roman empire rejected messianism, although the messianic creed never won over the entire intellectual classes of the Empire. The statements about the pride of the Jews and their refusal to mix with other nations had a factual and (on the Jewish side) also an ethical background, since they were afraid to lose their unique heritage of absolute truth and their privileged status vis-vis their Deity, i.e. their superior metaphysical status. The latter was based on mythological premises, the covenant of God with Abraham and on the laws of God, brought by the Levite Moyzes from Sinai on the way from Egypt to Canaan. It may be that the tribe of Levi was one of those Hyksos tribes driven out of Egypt and worshipping the deity JHVH which creed was later on accepted mainly in Judea, while the Northern part of Israel worshipped Baal and Astarte like other Canaanites. It may be that the Southern branch of the Hebrew tribes retained really a form of Egyptian cult of JHVH which name, however, is certainly not correctly read as Jahve, because the "ve" means "and" and the other part of the word is contained in the "H",

(probably "Aah" so that the word reads Jahveaah and means a divine couple, Jah and Aah) which the priestly tribe of Levi might have brought from Egypt and which is always opposed to the Northern (and Eastern) Baalim. This divine duality has perhaps its last reflection in the assumption of the Jewish mysticism, that there are two powers in heaven, perhaps also the couple Iah and Aah. The fact that this duality and its name are so assiduously hidden with a punctuation taken from Adonai and never pronounced, has its main reason in the mythological duality of the word. It is possible that this tribe of Levi which may mean the "great" tribe is a part of the Hyksos expulsion from Egypt which is dressed up as voluntary exodus from Egypt. It is worth noting that the hill where the Hyksos excavations were done in Palestine is called Tell-el-Yehuddiya and this was precisely a Hyksos camp which the Arabs identify as "Jewish hill". The Hyksos were expelled from Egypt about 1580 B.C. by the pharaoh Aahmes I whose name means the son of Aah, the word probably to be found in the other half of the word JHWH. The Levites were, it seems, the main promoters of the worship of JHWH and concentrated mostly in the Southern part of Canaan i.e. in Judea, while the priests of Baal held their sway mostly in the Northern part, i.e. Samaria. But the number "twelve" attributed to those tribes of Israel is obviously mythological. I have already noted that the name conferred on the Xristos Iesous "Jehoshah" begins and ends with the same letters as the mythical name of God JHWH. Here the letter "V" in the middle forms the connection between two deities JH and H.

The Xristos died in order to liberate humanity from death, to restore the immortality which was lost through the sin of Adam. This is the sense of the triumphal exclamation, giving the core of the Christian belief: "Death is swallowed up in victory. O death, where is thy victory? O death, where is thy sting?" (1 Cor. 15,54-55). Christianity is the belief in eternal life. If Passah was the feast of liberation from servitude in Egypt, Easter is the feast of liberation from death. It was this belief that attracted the Hellenistic population and could never be refuted by facts, if death and resurrection of the Xristos were only literary events.

The catacombs are the most important archeological relic of Christianity from antiquity. Why did they build these long winded underground cities? In order to preserve their places of burial from desecration or destruction by the pagans. This they did like the Jews, and obviously for similar reasons. But the main reason becomes clear, if one ponders the inner meaning of Christianity, namely securing eternal life for the dead and space for the resurrection of the dead. The Jews knew no aubalance of existence apart of the body, therefore the resurrection had to be in the form of the revival of the dead “the techiat hamethim” and in fact Lazarus was also “revived” in this way. Room had to be provided in the catacombs for the resurrected bodies. Cremation is therefore neither a Jewish nor a Christian form of burial.

The eternization of life was the main concern of the “Saints”, but this could not be accomplished without the intervention of the Logos in the form of the messiah and this was the main reason, why he had to come and came. The First Letter to the Corinthians states clearly, that if there is no resurrection of the Xristos, there is none for the faithful and no religion of this kind, the catacombs show on the contrary, that the Xristos did come, was resurrected and there was therefore a valid promise of resurrection. This Diaspora messianism with the promise of eternal life was a new and interesting concept, it was not some old Oriental cult, but the coming of the messiah was the condition sine qua non of eternal life. Messianism in Judea was different. The Xristos of the gospels is not interested at all in the fate of the Jewish people nor are his disciples interested in this particular concern. A Judean messianism must have dealt with the Roman rule and as long as that rule lasted, there could be no messianic age. Eternal life could not have had the same weight in Judea as elsewhere. Judea was the seat of God’s Temple and the abode of divine predilection, the abode of God himself, so that all inhabitants were under special guardianship of God, if they obeyed God’s laws. In this sense they needed no redemption. This was not the case elsewhere in the Hellenistic countries, in Rome itself. Here as elsewhere in the Jewish Diaspora messianism was completely cast in the concept of immortality, the eternity of life. As long

as the Temple of Jerusalem stood, this Diaspora messianism could not form itself as a separate religion, as heavenly Judaism, and when the Temple was destroyed, the saints explained that this was a punishment for the killing of the messiah, a kind of deicide. But this explanation was scarcely tenable, if one accepted Judaism as true religion, because then the destruction of God's temple was an act of iniquity, directed not against the Jewish people, but against God, in destroying his holy abode.

Messianism within the Hellenistic world was no Oriental cult, but a very interesting modern conception that the Xristos or Son of God or Logos who descended on earth to redeem humanity from its mortality and offered his own life for it. The eucharist was the magical means that could provide this immortality and the eucharist had also an implicit negative meaning: This is not the flesh of a Lamb, this is not a simple bread, this is not the blood of grapes, this is my flesh and my blood. This religion had also a very rich literature, namely the Septuagint, which was translated in Alexandria. But the writings of Philon and of Flavius Josephus and the apocrypha of the Jewish literature in Greek belonged to the same literary package. These were mostly recent writings of authors who were still alive not long ago. If the messianic story which was set in the old country (Judea) because the prophecies required such a stage, would have occurred in fact, Flavius Josephus would have certainly mentioned it, and the interpolation about the Xristos is a proof that the contemporaries were of the same opinion. The attractiveness of the messianic story and the deep emotional impact of the death of Christ is proved until this day, although almost 2000 years, i.e. 66 generations elapsed since then. When the messianic story was transmitted to the North, the Slavic nations chose out of it another item as their main religious concern: the Mother of God, not the Xristos occupied the main position, she was the Mother of God (in Poland: Bogu Rodzica) and this united two most precious properties of the female sex: virginity and maternity. According to Jewish ideas it is maternity that elevates the woman, eternal virginity would be a misfortune or a curse. Maternity in virginity is not a Jewish, but rather a Roman and hence Hellenistic idea just as the eucharist. Christianity as expressed in the gospels is by no

means pro-Jewish, it is rather anti-Jewish. The messianic idea of the saints self-immolation for liberating mankind of mortality and achieving this aim by the eucharist is utterly non-Jewish.

The way of Christianity

The way of Christianity was from Pessah to Easter, from the Pessah lamb to the Divine Lamb, from the simple benediction of bread and wine to the eucharist, but here divine intercession was necessary. This theory of God and his Son, the Logos and its incarnation in an Anointed one was conceived and developed in Alexandria and in Rome, not in Jerusalem and Tarsos, where there were not those intellectuals who could have conceived and evolved it. The first step to this development was the translation of the so-called Old Testament into Greek. The uprising of the Hasmoneans which occurred after this translation, was described in the Greek language. The main rite of the saints, the eucharist, i.e. the benediction, was probably worked out in the common meals or love-meals of the faithful. The Christian religion started with the transformation of the Feast of unleavened breads, i.e. the exodus of the Israelites from Egypt into the Feast of the killing or sacrificial death of the messiah. This is the basic transformation. It is the usages of the cult that dictate the events, not vice-versa. At the exodus feast the Paschal lamb was sacrificed. The messiah is the Paschal Lamb of humanity. Therefore he must die. It is his blood that saves mankind and redeems the disobedience of Adam. The symbolic transformation of the other Jewish holidays always connects them with the person of the messiah and transfigures them as for instance the second Jewish feast which becomes Whitsuntide and an outpouring of the Holy Ghost on the disciples of Christ. The last pilgrim-festival (the Feast of Tabernacles) disappears, but its Palm festival preceeds Easter, it is the symbolic saluting of the Xristos. The Day of Atonment becomes the Last Judgment and the second coming of Christ or of the Paraclets. A semantic investigation of Christian concepts shows that the Hebrew Pessah which turns into Easter has in Greek a similarly sounding word, namely "PasXein" which means

to suffer, so that Pessach is also the feast of suffering, namely the killing of the of the Xristos, while the initial letter of it, namely X (khi), shows by its form in which way the killing was performed. This Greek letter has other applications in the Xristian theology. It is the initial of the word Xaris (grace), it figures in the “euXarist”, “Xarisma” and the preceding letter k (kappa) figures in “kerygma” (the annunciation of the faith). If the letters of the divine name JHVH are of such importance, these above cited letters have also theirs. If Easter of the former PessaX is the central feast of the Christian calender, X (khi) is the central symbolic letter of the Christian faith.

If the eucharist is the central rite of Christianity, it shows that immortality or “athanasia” is the main concern of this faith and that this faith was originated in a country of Hellenistic civilization. It draws eternal life from the Xristos by eating his flesh and drinking his blood symbolically. If it is derived from the Jewish meal for the dead, it could never be instituted by the Xristos, because this was not offered to the bereaved, but by the bereaved to the deceased. It was a gift to him and he could not and would not ask for it. The bereaved may have eaten and drunk it vicariously for him and with him and this was supposed to comfort himself and the mourners. As for the “eucharist” or benediction, pronounced, when eating bread and drinking wine, the wording was: Barukh atha, Adonai elohenu, melech haolam (Praized be thou, Lord our God, King of the World), motzi lekhem min haarez (that drawest bread from the earth) or: boreh pri hagaphen (that createst the fruit of the vine). It is remarkable that this simple benediction pronounced innumerable times, becomes the vehicle to immortality. Whether this bread and wine were also meant as a viaticum for the dead, is possible, but it certainly could not have meant at that epoch of civilization, a literal eating of the body or a literal drinking of blood, although it may have represented it. It is a transformation of a custom, familiar to the Jews in a Hellenistic and philosophical sense in that it should purvey for the immortality of the communicants. The sense of the custom is that the deceased is still alive and eats and drinks with the mourners. It is not that he is eaten. This transformation of a familiar custom to its very opposite — at least psychologically and symbolically — is

naturally due to the desire of participating in the eternal life of the messiah. To deny this last meal to a deceased would of course dishonor him, but on the other hand he would not demand it. Of course a Jew would never ask for it other Jews, because it would have been superfluous; if therefore the Xristos addresses in this way his disciples, this would have a sense in a non-Jewish Hellenistic milieu, unfamiliar with Jewish customs. Between Jews, as I have said, it is a psychological impossibility. A Jew could never put this demand into the mouth of another one who is going to die.

The whole outline of the gospel biography of the Xristos is contained in the Chapter 53 of Deuterosephias; the gospels contain merely a dramatic paraphrase of this chapter. 53,3 states especially: He is despised and rejected by of men; a man of sorrows and acquainted with griefs ... 54 ... he hath borne our griefs, and carried our sorrows ... 53,5 ... and the Lord hath laid on him the iniquity of us all." 53,7 ... he was afflicted, yet he opened not his mouth: he is brought as a lamb to the slaughter, ..." 53,8 ... "He was taken from prison and from judgment ... he was cut off out of the land of the living ..." 53,9 "And he made his grave with the wicked, and with the rich in his death; because he had done no violence, neither was any deceit in his mouth" This description, however, does not refer to an individual and the word "messiah" is not even once mentioned. This refers to the afflictions of the people of Israel which will come to an end. This is shown in 53,12: Therefore will I divide him a portion with the great, and he shall divide the spoil with the strong; because he has poured out his soul unto death: and he was numbered with the transgressors; and he bare the sin of many, and made intercession for the transgressors." The first sentence of 53,12 has, no good sense if related to a single individual. The whole is presented with detail, but it is nonetheless nothing else than a metaphor, and the "primum comparationis" is the people of Israel. It is a misunderstanding to refer it to a person; this is all the clearer, if we continue to read the chapter 54. Here the greatness of the restored Israel is described: "... and thy seed will inherit the Gentiles ...", 54,5: For thy Maker is thine husband; the Lord of hosts is his name, and thy Redeemer is the Holy one of Israel;

The God of the whole earth shall he be called.” Thus the true Messiah is God himself, not a man.

St. John the Baptist was beheaded by a semi-Jewish king Herodes Antipas, not Herodes the Great. There is no logical reason, why a Xristos, if he is a Jewish messiah and expiates the sins of his people or of mankind, should suffer a more humiliating and inhuman cruel death, since the Jews did not adopt it for their transgressors. If such an expiation is based on the “ius talionis”, then the Xristos is not a Jewish, but a Roman messiah, since only the Romans inflicted this kind of death to their slaves so that if the Roman messiah had to expiate their sins of cruelty, he might have been crucified, but in Palestine or Judea as a kind of punishment of religious dissidence, crucifixion would have been a monstrosity, and even if the Jews thought that this itinerant preacher had to be killed, there is no reason to assume, that they had to resort to this monstrous kind of death, customary in Rome toward slaves. Or have we to assume that this was psychologically a Roman messiah and that in expiating Roman sins he had to suffer a Roman death? Psychologically to the authors of the gospels this was really a Roman or Greco-Roman Hellenistic messiah, who expiated in this form the Roman sins. It is very characteristic that the authors inflict a Roman death on a allegedly Jewish messiah even in a literary sense. In the last instance this means that a Roman messiah would have to be crucified to expiate the Roman sins according to the “ius talionis”. In a broader sense it also means that the sins of mankind are so great that only a God could expiate them. But since God does not descend on earth, it must be done — if at all — by his son.

Since the virtues and vices of mankind are everywhere similar, the ethical teachings cannot be very different. But Christianity teaches in addition humility, and if possible, total sexual abstention or as the second best, monogamy, avoidance of sexual perversion — the latter was punished by death in the Jewish law — is also demanded. This was the main sin of the Hellenistic world. Just as crucifixion of the messiah was demanded by Hellenistic Christians to set straight the laws of Rome, total abstention is demanded to correct the Hellenistic sexual perversions and sexual intemperance. But since the messianic

age meant also the end of the world, sexual excesses were an outrage and production of progeny unnecessary. Humility in face of the end of the world is an eschatological virtue. But humility is the only weapon of the weak and unfortunate, to whom the Christian "kerygma" addresses itself. Humility, forbearance, patience, suffering, love, hope and faith, pardoning of injustices, non-resistance to evil, are all the virtues of the weak and unfortunate and more lacking in Roman upper society than elsewhere. Christian teachings were accepted in the Roman world by those who were discriminated most. These people were seldom pure Romans or pure Greeks, quite apart from the fact that in this Hellenistic world the Greeks were Orientalized and the Orientals Hellenized. These people were chiefly Hellenized Orientals. The chief philosopher of Christianity in antiquity was St. Augustin, a Numidian; the translator of the Bible into Latin, St. Hieronymus, was a Slav; the chief Christian historian of Justinian, Procopius was a Christianized Jew, they were all of a mixed stock.

By manipulating a mock-trial the authors of the gospels managed to impute to the Jews a crime they did not practice, namely crucifixion, to exculpate a dubious Roman procurator allegedly intimidated by a Jewish mob, to present a Jewish fisherman (Peter) as a warrior with a sword, to let him cut off an ear which, however, also was none-the-less restored miraculously; to let the cock crow as a sign of lie, to let the Jewish Ephialtes called Judas sell his master for thirty pieces of silver etc. etc.

But it should be noted, that the death of the messiah and his teachings coincided with the destruction of the Jewish state and that the gospels use the death of the messiah to justify this destruction, which they approve by accusing all Jewish institutions, the synhedrion, the archpriest and its spiritual leaders, the Pharisees, that all the known enemies of the Jews are painted as better then the Jews, for instance the Samaritans, the Romans, the Greeks etc. The warfare against the Jews and the Jewish state is here continued spiritually. The New Testament literature is partly an ethnically determined anti-Jewish Hellenistic enterprise. The specific feature of this literature is that it uses the words and life of an allegedly Jewish prophet or

Xristos to condemn the Jews. They are so to speak outcasts according to their own writings, the prophecies of the Old Testament and the prophets of old.

There was certainly a great difference between the Hellenistic Diaspora Jews of Alexandria or Rome and those of Palestine. The Palestinian Jews scarcely knew Philon and the Septuagint translation of the Jewish Bible was made in the first place for those Hellenistic Jews who did not know the Hebrew or Aramaic language. The Palestinian Jews were anti-Roman, while the Hellenistic Jews in Alexandria depended for their survival on Roman goodwill and help. The Logos philosophy of Philon was certainly unknown to the Jews of Judea and his method of symbolic interpretation of the Septuagint was alien to them. But it is equally unlikely that the Jews of Alexandria or Rome undertook a trip to Judea to find there the incarnation of the Logos. The latter in the shape of the Xristos was rather a purely literary assumption.

The crucifix with the bleeding Jesus is not the description of the messiah's death, but rather a symbol of medieval Christianity. The middle ages wallowed in suffering and the access to holiness was through suffering. In antiquity the basic virtue of the saints was rather love.

Because of the contradiction between Judaic Palestinian and Hellenistic civilization of Alexandria and Rome an incongruity arose between the Xristos and the land on which he was grafted and to which he was imputed. It was spiritually a Hellenistic Xristos put on the Judean soil, not a native messiah. The lands of Europe accepted a Hellenistic Xristos, not a Jewish messiah. They were the heirs of the Hellenistic civilization. The fact that this Xristos was a literary creation did not affect the course of events, because there was still left a messianic ideal to emulate. For the common people the Christian pantheon constituted a Divine family with a hidden Father, a Virgin-Mother and a martyred Son. The Germanic, Celtic and Slavic nations took over the Hellenistic civilization with their Hellenistic religion couched in the Greek Latin and Old Slavic and partly in the Gothic languages. The exclamation "Logos sarx egeneto" was the founding of Christianity. But we do not know what the author of these words saw or heard, when he uttered them.

Maybe he had some vision. But this seems a mystical happening, not a historical one.

On the other hand, the addition of such linguistic details in the gospel of St. John as “gabbata” i.e. elevation or podium of the presiding judge, the elevated seat of Pilatus, is supposed to add local color and authenticity to the description, although none of the writers was there and none affirms of having done so. If the messiah is assumed to be the founder of the faith or if any apostle including St. Paul is supposed to be it, the Athanasian creed, the Trinitarian basis of Christianity is not understandable. This is also the case, if, as is often done, the word “Logos” is translated as “word” so that not the Logos, but the word becomes flesh. Then misunderstanding is possible, because the sentence “Logos sarx egeneto” could then be referred to the book of Genesis and to the creation of the world by God as for instance “Let there be lights ...” (Fiat lux). However, neither the heavens nor the earth nor the lights in the firmament of heaven are “sarx” or a body. This phrase can therefore only be related to the incarnation of the Logos. The spread of the faith of the saints in the West, the catacombs of Rome, the absence of any archeological remnants of the Christian faith in the East and especially in Palestine, the language of the New Testament which is Greek, all this would be totally incomprehensible, if from the faith of the saints would spread from the East, namely Judea, and not from Rome. Neither the literature nor the archeological relics are Judean nor the whole metaphysical structure. What is Judean, are the so-called prophecies and the quotations referring to them. Not one writer of the New Testament is asserting, that he is a Judean writing in Greek as did Flavius Josephus, then why should that be assumed? And if it is not assumed, where is the Judean title to his knowledge? It could at best be some hearsay.

It may be that when it was said by the gospel that three Oriental kings worshipped the Jesus child – the first Trinity – and the family of the messiah sought refuge in Egypt, the reverse way of Moses – the authors of this story knew that it was from Egypt, namely Alexandria, that the epiphany and the belief in the son of God or Logos came and that this child had to be its incarnation. Its step-father has the name of Joseph as

once the son of Jacob who ruled Egypt in the past.

The eucharist is based on a simile: the body of the messiah is the reconstructed Jewish temple of Jerusalem, The shewbreads are compared with his body, and the blood of the sacrificed Passah lamb, and hence his blood, with the red wine drunk on Passah eve.

This comparison has a symbolic meaning and the latter is naturally Hellenistic. A Jewish scholar would never hit upon such comparison and symbol, and therefore it could not originate in a Palestinian messiah. It was invented after the destruction of the Temple of Jerusalem.

If the gospel of St. Marc was written in Alexandria – as it was – 40 years after the presumptive death of the messiah, i.e. during or after the Roman-Jewish war, then all gospels are a part of the pro-Roman Hellenistic war literature directed against the Palestinian Jews. The Alexandrian Jews collaborated with the Romans, otherwise the nephew of the philosopher Philon would not have taken part in that war on the Roman side as a general. This Jewish uprising was opposed by the Diaspora Jews dependent on Roman goodwill, because of the hostility of the native Hellenistic population.

Original sin

Adam is a Babylonian name like the month Adar, but he has nothing to do with the Hellenistic concept of the original sin. His sin is simply disobedience to the Lord, and therefore he was driven from the paradise, i.e. the Garden *Eden*, i.e. the Garden *Adam's*. His alleged son Abel, in Hebrew *Hebel*, probably from the reversed syllable Ah instead. He is also a Babylonian name as Ab-Bel, the Father Bel or the god Bel shows. Havah or Eva (the Living) is formed from Adam's rib, she is therefore not his "wife", whatever that means, but his descendant just like the god Abel and the deity Kain. Kain is obviously a variant of *Chaim* (Life) and its feminine correspondent is just Havah or Hayah which is identical in meaning with Havah. But Hayah also means: *Animal*, and this is very suggestive. The parable about the fruits which should be or should not be eaten, refers

probably to the brothers Abel and Kain (the gods of the heaven and of the life) which she might have “eaten” at the instigation of the Serpent-god. She might have preferred the terrestrial Kain or Chaim who “killed” therefore the heavenly god Abel. This is the sin of Havah. She chose between good and evil, and preferred evil.

God punished Adam and Eve, drove them from the Garden Adam's and let them live the pangs of birth and the toil of life. But this is not the true punishment for their sin. As for Kain or Chaim (Life) he bears the mark of the murderer and finds no rest, because his conscience does not let him rest. All these punishments for their failings are according to the laws of God and of men. But this is not the punishment of the original sin, the latter consists not according the Genesis of the Old Testament — which was sketched above — but according to Hellenistic speculation owing to Adam's loss of immortality. He ceased to be immortal and this was his original sin. This loss of immortality or of eternal life can only be healed by the incarnate Logos or the messiah. We have here therefore one more example of the symbolic interpretation of the Scripture in the Hellenistic sense. Original Jewish mythology is based on three regions: the Chaldeo-Babylonian, the Arameo-Canaanite and the Judeo-Egyptian.

Resume

Christianity is at its origin a purely philosophical and literary, not a historical realistic phenomenon. It is capsuled in the saying: Iesous Xristos, theou hyios soter. This comes from the disciples of Philon and the only reason why Iesous is called Theou hyios, a son of God, is that Philon called so the Logos and the Xristos was identified with the Logos. However, the word “hyios” has here not the precise literal Greek, but the broader Hebrew meaning of the word “ben”. Bnei Babel does not mean the sons of Babel, but simply the Babylonians, and “Bath” Babel does not mean a daughter of Babel, but a Babylonian woman as “bath Abraham” means a proselyte female. As for the expression “soter”, saviour, this is not a religious, but a political

honorific title, conferred by a political body, for instance the Roman senate, on Octavian, and by other lands on other Hellenistic rulers. It is given only to royalty and has nothing to do with religion. These two appellations could only be accorded the Xristos in a non-Jewish country like Egypt, in a Hellenistic city like Alexandria.

Since the most ancient gospel (of St. Marc) was written at the earliest in 70 A.D., it is a part of the Hellenistic-Roman war literature directed against the Palestinian Jews, so that all gospels are such war propaganda. They are all written so late after the alleged death of the Xristos that they are purely literary, not historical works. The disciples of the Xristos or apostles are “fishermen”, because the above quoted monogram of Xristianity forms in its initial letters the word “ichthys” which means “fish” in Greek, and this is merely a literary reason as the lake Genezareth is merely a literary stage.

The Xristos replaces the Jewish Temple destroyed in the war, and the meaning of the eucharist confirms that. All this has nothing to do with Palestine. The identification of the messiah with the Logos is merely a literary supposition. And the gospels are supposed to prove that the Palestina Jews, who waged war against the Romans, were thoroughly evil, because they killed even their last and greatest saint.